

THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 1.

DECEMBER, 1889.

No. 3.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

REDEMPTION AFTER DEATH.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, N. Y. CITY.

THE time has fully come when Protestant Churches are compelled to confront the question of the Middle State and the nature of Christian life therein. This crisis is due : (1) to an entire change of attitude toward the Second Advent of Jesus Christ ; (2) to the spread in the churches of the Arminian doctrine of probation ; (3) to the general acceptance of the new doctrine of the universal salvation of infants ; (4) to the development of the doctrine of sin and guilt in connection with a further unfolding of Philosophical Ethics and a deeper study of Christian Ethics. In these four directions Protestantism and especially Calvinistic Churches, have departed a long distance from the Creeds of the Reformation and the Confession and Catechisms of Westminster.

I. Limiting the Love of God.

The doctrine of the Middle State depends chiefly upon the doctrine of redemption. All mankind are born into this world in a condition of sin and ruin. All need redemption. Redemption is born of the love of God. God is love. The love of God is the well-spring of election, predestination unto life, and all the acts and works of God for the accomplishment of the redemption of man. It is a doctrine of scholastic Protestants that divine sovereignty is the source of the election. Some of these scholastic divines have gone so far in their subordination of the divine love to the divine sovereignty, that they have pushed the love of God and the compassion of the heavenly Father behind the justice of the judge and the good pleasure of the sovereign ; and thereby have come close to the unpardonable sin of limiting the grace of God and denying the power of the Divine Spirit. A genuine Protestantism, such as we find in the creeds of the Reformation, teaches that God's election is an election of grace. The grace of

God is so vast and inexhaustible that we may assume that God will redeem a larger number of our race than any man could suppose. God's love and power to save are infinitely greater than the love and redemptive yearnings of all creatures combined.

The love of God works redemption through Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world, and through the Holy Spirit, who imparts the new life and growth without which salvation is impossible ; and also through the paternal superintendence and government of the Heavenly Father. The redeemed consist, therefore, of those who belong to the elect of God, who have been purchased by Jesus Christ and who have been born of the Holy Spirit. The redeemed consist of the elect only. There can be no redemption that does not originate in the election of grace ; in the love of the Heavenly Father's heart. The Reformers and Puritans apprehended the love of God and magnified the divine grace in election and predestination. That is the reason they made so much of these high doctrines. They also emphasized the doctrine of forgiveness of sins, which is so closely related to the doctrine of the divine grace. Scholastic divines, when they substituted sovereign election for the election of grace, divided mankind into two classes, those predestinated unto life and those predestinated unto everlasting death, and thus made both classes dependent upon the good pleasure of the will of the sovereign, without regard to their actual sins or acceptance of the provisions of redemption. As a natural result of this theory the mass of mankind were doomed to everlasting perdition in hell fire, and only a few were snatched from the burning. These scholastic divines also substituted God the Judge for God the Father, and accordingly overlooked the Fatherhood of God and abandoned the doctrine of for-

givenness of sins. The supreme forms of this scholasticism were the supralapsarian theory, that made the decree of election and preterition prior to the decrees of the creation and the fall of man, and the kindred Antinomian theory, that made justification eternal and entirely independent of human faith and repentance. Such scholasticism had no need of a Middle State between Death and the Day of Judgment. It is hard to see what need there was of life in the present world. It is difficult for this theory to explain why God did not send men to heaven and hell at once in accordance with his arbitrary and eternal decree, which has no respect to life in this world and life after death, without requiring them to undergo a life and death which have no effect whatever upon their eternal welfare. Antinomianism has ever been regarded as a heresy. It was a sad mistake that supralapsarianism was not placed with Antinomianism in the catalogue of heresies. The repute of a few distinguished divines, who maintained it, ought not to have restrained the Church from branding their error with the stigma it deserves.

God's love is a love that is eternal in its origin. It is also everlasting in its outgoings toward God's creatures. It is a love prior to time and above and beyond all time, but it is also a love that enters into time and pervades all time. If we have a real apprehension of the Living God and of the Fatherhood of God we cannot doubt that the divine love is a living and unfolding love, and that it assumes the form of parental love that never forsakes the child from his birth onward through all the ages of his growth, even to the end. From this point of view, if life in this world is brief and life in the Middle State is long, we must rise to the conception of the love of God as accomplishing even greater works of redemption in the Middle State than in this world. The Roman Catholic Church has ever had this conception. Its doctrine of purgatory has a powerful influence upon the religious life in this world, and upon the entire system of Roman Theology. Protestantism, when it threw overboard the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory, also threw away with it much of the ancient Catholic doctrine of the Middle State. It magnified the love of God in the grace of election and forgiveness of sins in this life, but did not trace the workings of the divine grace in the Middle State.

II. The Living God.

Protestantism, however, laid hold of the doctrine of the Living God, and found vital

union with Him in redemption, and, in this respect, overcame the abstract ideas of God that governed the Roman Church. This doctrine of the Living God was abandoned by Protestant scholastics. Dr. Isaac Dorner again brought it into prominence, and it is becoming fruitful in a living theology. This doctrine is important for the unfolding of the Middle State. Those who are in vital relations with the Living God can never die. They live on beyond the gate of death; they live the life of God, in communion with God. Such a life, hid in this world with Christ, there manifests itself in its richness and fulness. It unfolds from one degree of glory into another. What wonders of redemption are wrapped up in life with God! What infinite possibilities are within the reach of that being whose life is begotten of God, and whose life has no other end or aim than the transcendent experience of divine sonship and the supreme blessedness of God-likeness!

III. Narrow Views of Redemption.

Protestantism was at fault in taking too narrow a view of redemption. It was necessary to magnify justification by faith and carefully separate it from sanctification and glorification, but it was a mistake to lay such stress on justification and faith that sanctification and love were thrown into the background, and this to such an extent that some divines had the assurance to teach that good works were hurtful to salvation. This narrowing of the original base of the Reformation was the chief reason why Staupitz and other evangelical men preferred to remain in the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome still maintains a more comprehensive view of redemption than is common in Protestant Churches. Her fault is that she does not distinguish and properly define justification and sanctification. Protestantism defined justification, but left sanctification in a very uncertain condition. The Puritan Reformation unfolded the doctrine of sanctification and defined it as a progressive work of God, but did not define its appropriating instrument. It laid stress on the importance of sanctification in this life. It saw that sanctification must be completed in the Middle State, but it left this subject in such an obscure form that it has been the general opinion in Calvinistic Churches that sanctification was completed at the very moment of death.

IV. Judgment at Death.

This interpretation was favored by the scholastic divines, who coined the doctrine

of a
heaven
of a
the So
dom:
ture:
all; f
the b
port
ligion
of So
judg
supre
Fu
at de
the l
god
up b
Ages
estan
doct
the l
and
cond
lost.
at d
and
and
tory

F
in t
has
the
men
the
and
neu
hyr
tur
An
gai
of
the
sep
a t
It
mi
div
Th
it
th
be
do
Th
ni
ed

So

of a judgment at death which assigns to heaven or hell or purgatory. This doctrine of a judgment at death has no warrant in the Scriptures or in the creeds of Christendom. It is not only unsupported by Scripture and the Symbols, but it violates them all; for it throws the day of judgment into the background, robs it of its place and importance in the Christian system and in religious experience, and applies many passages of Scripture that belong only to it, to the judgment at death, and so makes death the supreme issue.

Furthermore, the doctrine of a judgment at death is a heathen doctrine derived from the heathen mythological conception of a god of the realm of the dead. It was taken up by the scholastic divines of the Middle Ages, and borrowed from them by the Protestant scholastics. It does violence to the doctrine of Scripture and the creeds, that the human race had its probation in Adam, and when he fell was judged in him and condemned to death and the abode of the lost. The heathen doctrine of a judgment at death throws both the original judgment and the final judgment into the background, and puts a crisis in a false place in the history of redemption.*

V. The Second Advent.

Furthermore, the attitude of Theology, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, has been changed toward the great crisis of the Second Advent and the Day of Judgment. The doctrine of the Scriptures and the doctrine of the Church in all its Creeds and Liturgies is that the Advent is imminent. This is expressed in that wonderful hymn, *Dies Irae*. But in the eighteenth century two errors, that were revived by the Anabaptists and a few isolated scholars, gained a rapid supremacy in the Theology of the Protestant Churches. The one of these is the Premillenarian doctrine. This separated the advent of the Messiah by a thousand years from the last judgment. It retained the church doctrine of the imminency of the Advent, but pushed the divine judgment into the background. The other error was still more serious, for it postponed the second Advent as well as the judgment until after the Millennium had been completed, and thus antagonized the doctrine of the Church as to the great crisis. This latter opinion has so prevailed in the nineteenth century, that it has been regarded as orthodox, owing to its advocacy by

leading divines in the British and American Churches.*

Both of these serious errors should be banished, with the doctrine of a particular judgment at death, as all alike contrary to the Scriptures and the Creeds; and as obstructions to the development of a Biblical and Historical Theology. The Millennium of the Scriptures and of the Fathers is not an object for our future expectation. The Church has already enjoyed that experience and is enjoying it now. The Millennium of popular conception is a conceit without support in the Scriptures or in the Creeds. The crisis that we are to look forward to, long for, watch for, and pray for, is the Advent of our Lord in glory and judgment at the end of the age, to glorify his saints and perfect his kingdom. In modern Eschatology the Millennium has usurped the place of the Middle State.

VI. The Means of Grace.

The Roman Catholics teach that the divine grace is imparted by the sacraments of the Church. Accordingly, all who have not enjoyed these sacraments are excluded from heaven, and also from purgatory. The Lutherans teach that the grace of God is imparted by word and sacraments. It is difficult for the Lutheran to extend redemption beyond the bounds of the Christian Church and the use of the means of grace. The Reformed Churches teach that the divine grace is not limited to the ordinary means, and hence the Divine Spirit may work apart from the Church and its ordinances, and so it is possible to conceive that the Kingdom of God is more extensive than the visible Church. But the question still remains, How may the divine grace be appropriated by the person to be redeemed?

The Protestant Reformation made an important advance in the History of Doctrine by its definition of *Justification by Faith only*. This is the banner doctrine of Protestantism, the doctrine by which the Church stands or falls. The Roman Catholics confound justification and sanctification. They make sanctification the product of the sacraments of the Church in this life. It is appropriated by the use of the sacraments. It is carried on in the Middle State by purgatorial fires. The Protestants separated justification from sanctification, and represented that justification was appropriated by *faith alone*, and not through the bare use of the sacraments. They taught that sanctification was the fruit of justification, but they did

* See Briggs' *Whither?* pp. 195 seq., 1889, Charles Scribner's Sons.

* Briggs' *Whither?* pp. 200 seq.

not carefully define it. It is the merit of the Puritan Reformation that it defined sanctification, repentance, and the doctrines related to them. These doctrines were considered in their relation to this life and the ultimate state, but were not applied to the Middle State.

Calvinism remained indifferent to the question of the Middle State, because it was content to leave all to the electing grace of God.

VII. Probation.

But Arminianism and Semi-Arminianism could not be so indifferent. Daniel Whitby first formulated the doctrine of Probation in this life, in his attack upon the Five Points of Calvinism; and Bishop Butler gave it currency among all the opponents of English Deism, so that it has been largely appropriated by Calvinists, and has in many respects warped Calvinistic Theology.*

The doctrine that this life is a probation calls attention to the fact that it is so in fact only to a very small portion of our race. And if the redemption of a part depends on their use of their probation, how can those be saved who have no probation at all? It seems necessary, therefore, to extend probation for these into the Middle State, or to give the vast majority of mankind over to the devil. Accordingly, Whitby taught the annihilation of the wicked,† and Butler consistently held to the extension of probation into the future life.‡ Other probationists must either follow their example or else abandon the doctrine of probation altogether. Arminians and Semi-Arminians must in the end take one of these two alternative courses.

Arminians and Semi-Arminians, who are in our churches, and who believe in the doctrine of probation, must face this question. If probation is to be extended to the Middle State, they must in some way conceive of the gospel extending into Hades, for it is difficult to see any possibility for regeneration there without it. Several theories have been proposed to overcome this difficulty.

(1) Some think that when our Saviour preached to the imprisoned spirits he organized those whom he saved into a church, and left them in Abaddon with a commission to preach his gospel to the lost. This is not in itself impossible. It might be said that such a mission would be so difficult and exacting, that it is hard to believe that the Saviour would lay it upon any of his re-

deemed. And yet I cannot help the thought that there have been and are to-day Christians who would be willing to go into the depths of Abaddon to glorify Christ and save souls. How much more, those who may have been redeemed by Christ in Abaddon itself might regard it as a privilege to labor for him in this prison of the lost!

(2) It has been conjectured that hypocrites and others, who know the gospel, but have no saving experience of it here, may recall it there and be saved by it, and in this way become the preachers of Hades. In that ingenious book, *Letters from Hell*, the author suggests that hypocritical priests and people assemble in church on the sabbaths in Hell as was their habit in this world, and that they are tormented by not being able to recall the gospel to their minds. It seems to me that it is far more likely that the larger portion of them would remember it. Such a paralysis of the memory is unpsychological. The lost are not to be imbeciles or madmen.

And it is not incredible that a considerable portion of the Bible might be recovered from the memories of those who go thither. This is certainly true if the current opinions in the Christian Churches are true, that all Heretics and Jews are sent there. A Hades full of Protestants, as the Romanists think, could hardly be without the Gospel. A place of torment where Roman Catholics are found by the hundreds of millions—popes, archbishops, monks, nuns, and all, could hardly be in such terrible ignorance of Christ and his Word. The Old Testament, with its Messianic promise, could hardly pass from the minds of all Jews. Even Unitarians, Universalists, and German Rationalists might reasonably recall some of those passages of the New Testament that contain in them the sum of the gospel, and are called by Luther little Bibles. In this case we would have to ask whether the gospel could lose its power there; whether it would be deprived of the influence of the Divine Spirit, and finally, whether all those who have gone there have become so hardened as to be incapable of faith and repentance?

(3) It has been generally thought by the advocates of an extension of redemption to the abode of the lost, that the Saviour might commission some of the redeemed of this world to preach his gospel there. It is true this would be a difficult and hazardous work for any man to undertake. It is true that there was an impassable gulf that Abraham and Lazarus were not allowed to cross. But this did not prevent our Saviour from crossing that gulf during his ministry to the

* Briggs' *Whither?* pp. 217 seq.

† Commentaries, II. Thess., p. 391, ed. 1710.

‡ Analogy, I. 13, II. 6.

underworld, and it does not exclude the possibility that he might bridge that chasm for the heralds of redemption in his wondrous love for lost souls. It is conceivable that he may have done this. But it is without any warrant from Holy Scripture and must remain pure conjecture. The difficulty lies not in the inability of the Messiah to send, or in the readiness of preachers to go, but in the feasibility of the work itself.

Many in the early Church thought this work feasible. The Shepherd of Hermas represents the apostles and martyrs as carrying on the preaching of Christ in Hades. And, indeed, what man is there, who has a spark of heroism, who would not rather work for Christ among the lost in Hades, if there were any possibility of such a work, than to pass centuries in a dreamy state of existence in Paradise, or live a life of ease and selfish gratification in the heights of heaven? Far better to work in Sheol than idle in heaven. The current views of the state of blessedness are unethical and demoralizing. They have little attraction for men of intellect and power, or for souls on fire with love to Christ and eager for the redemption of men. If we cannot serve our Saviour in heaven better than on earth, there is little to attract us after death. But thanks be unto God, we know that we may glorify him in the better world. We may share the aim of Paul, that whether in heaven or on earth we may be well-pleasing to Him. There are inexhaustible treasures of redemption that we may appropriate for ourselves, and that we may share in distributing to others.

All such theories of redemption of lost souls after death are castles in the air. No one can put any confidence in them. They have no solid ground on which to rest. They are not so dangerous as some would have it; they do not convince any one; they cannot disturb the real faith of the Church. They may unsettle those who see the crisis for mankind in the event of death. And they will render real service if they should destroy this error altogether.

They may expose the weakness of the current Eschatology. They may thus be a blessing in disguise. For the real faith of the Church, as expressed in the creeds of Christendom, looks forward, now as in the ages of the past, not to the day of death or a millennium, but to the Second Advent of the Messiah and his day of judgment, when He will make the final decision that will issue in everlasting ruin to some wretched creatures but in everlasting bliss to the human race as a whole.

VIII. Salvation of Infants.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the Lutheran, Anglican, and Reformed National Churches, the entire population belonged to the Church by baptism, and the great majority by partaking of the Lord's Supper. The National Churches took entire possession of their respective countries, and either banished, reduced to submission, imprisoned, or put to death dissenters. The conception of the everlasting death of children did not spring into the mind of theologians or the people, except so far as they were involved in the everlasting damnation of the heathen. This was taken as a matter of course. But in those days there was little contact with the heathen, and the mind of men was not impressed with this awful fact. There were a few theologians, such as Zwingli and Cœlius Secundus Curio, who held that the grace of God extended to the heathen. But at that time theology did not confront the problem.

The development of Puritanism in the seventeenth century and the origination of a large number of sects in Holland and Great Britain, such as Anabaptists, Baptists, Quakers, Unitarians, Universalists, Arminians, and the new circumstances that arose, disclosing thousands and millions of unbaptized children in Christian lands, forced the question of the salvation of unbaptized children upon the attention of theologians. Furthermore, the result of the religious conflicts in Great Britain and Holland produced a large class of men and women who declined communion with the churches in the way of sacrament. The strict rules of the dissenting churches, excluding all but those who would comply with their rules, and changing the churches into a multitude of religious clubs, increased the number of the population who did not belong to the Church and were not professing Christians. This forced the ministry to consider whether these men and women, many of them leading upright lives, were to be damned in Hell forever. In the eighteenth century these matters came before the mind and heart of Christians as never before. The result of these things has been a gradual change of opinion on these subjects, and the recognition of the universal salvation of infants and the admission that men may be saved who are not in communion with the Church.

The present century brought the Church of Christ face to face with the heathen world. Hundreds of millions of heathen stand over against nominal Christians half their number. The latter must be reduced by multi-

tudes who are inhabitants of Christian lands, but who do not profess the faith of Christ. It is safe to say that there are not one hundred millions on the earth to-day who comply with the methods of salvation taught in Christian Churches. The damnation of these millions of heathen, who have never heard of Christ, and millions of nominal Christians, who do not use the means of grace offered them by the Church, is an awful fact for the Church to confront after nearly two thousand years of Christianity on the earth. The ministry and the people do not really believe that these multitudes will be damned. The matter is eased a little by the theory that the dying infants of the heathen are saved, and some of the best of heathen adults may attain redemption; but the great mass of the adult population of Asia and Africa—yes, of Europe and America also—are doomed to hell-fire according to the popular theology. The ministers preach it, and the people listen to this doctrine as they do to many others, but they are not moved by it. They accept it as orthodox doctrine without understanding it; but they do not really believe it in their hearts. If they did they would be more worthy of damnation than the heathen themselves. If a single man were in peril of physical death, the whole community would be aroused to save him. No price would be too great. Men and women would cheerfully risk their lives to save him. Those who would not do this would be regarded as base cowards. But here, according to the average missionary sermon, are untold millions of heathen perishing without the gospel, and at death going into everlasting fire. Vast multitudes of unevangelized persons in our cities and towns and villages are confronting the same cruel destiny.

If the ministry and people really believed it they would pour out their wealth like water; they would rush in masses to the heathen world with the gospel of redemption. There would be a new crusade that would put the old crusades to shame. Those who have the gospel, and will not give it to others who know it not, may incur a worse doom in the day of judgment than the ignorant. Those who knew the Lord's will and did it not will be beaten with many stripes; those who knew not and did things worthy of stripes with few stripes.*

The difficulty is to construct the doctrine of the salvation of infants and the heathen in harmony with established doctrines.

The Protestant doctrine of justification by

faith implies that there can be no salvation without justification on the part of God and faith on the part of man. The Westminster doctrine is that,

"God did from all eternity, decree to justify all the elect; and Christ did, in the fulness of time, die for their sins, and rise again for their justification; nevertheless they are not justified, until the Holy Spirit doth, in due time, actually apply Christ unto them" (xi. 4).

This passage not only teaches the common Protestant doctrine of justification and connects it with the doctrine of election, but it also rules out the Antinomian doctrine of eternal justification without faith, which was current in the time of the Westminster Assembly. The Westminster divines did not think of any application of Christ apart from personal faith; for they distinctly state:

"Redemption is certainly applied, and effectually communicated, to all those for whom Christ hath purchased it; who are in time by the Holy Ghost enabled to believe in Christ, according to the gospel" (Larger Catechism, Ans. 59).

Believing in Christ is therefore universal so far as the elect of God and the redeemed of Christ are concerned. There is no salvation without personal faith.

The Westminster divines were not clear in their views as to the faith of infants and incapables. Some supposed that the children, being bound in the covenant with their parents, the parents' faith laid hold of justification for their children; others supposed that the germs of faith and repentance were planted in them by the Holy Spirit in the work of regeneration either in connection with Baptism or apart from it.

No orthodox Protestant thought of justification without the exercise of personal faith on the part of the justified. There must be an application of Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit to every one to be saved, and there must be a personal appropriation of Jesus Christ on the part of all who are redeemed. The order of Salvation is necessary in all its parts for every child of God.

"Those whom God effectually calleth he also freely justifieth" (xi. 1). (*Westminster Confession of Faith*.) "All those that are justified, God vouchsafeth, in and for his only Son, Jesus Christ, to make partakers of the grace of adoption" (xii. 1). "They who are effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, are farther sanctified really and personally" (xiii. 1). "They whom God hath accepted in his Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved" (xvii. 1).

There is but one way of salvation for all, one *ordo salutis*. There is but one kind of justification, one kind of sanctification, one

* Luke xii. 48.

kind of saving faith, and one kind of repentance unto life. The modern extension of the doctrine of redemption so as to include not only infants of believers, but all infants; and also so as to embrace not only the people of God under the Old Covenant and the people of God who accept the New Covenant, but also multitudes from among the heathen, who have not the light of either of these covenants, but only the light of nature, raises the question how these can be saved consistently with the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith and the Puritan doctrine of sanctification. It is evident that the orthodox divines of the seventeenth century constructed their systems of doctrine without any conception of such an extension of redemption. The theory of some modern theologians, such as the elder and younger Hodge, that they may be saved without personal faith, subverts the fundamental principle of Protestantism. The current unformulated theory that they can be saved without acceptance of the righteousness of Christ undermines the fundamental principle of Christianity. Christians are not saved in classes or masses, but as individuals out of the mass of corruption. It is anti-Christian to say that the entire race of men may be regarded as redeemed, unless it is expressly said that they are lost. On the contrary, the Bible and the Creeds teach that all are lost unless they are personally redeemed and experience the work of grace. There must be some way in which infants, incapables and pious men beyond the bounds of Christendom may be brought into contact with God and His Christ, and have an opportunity to believe in him, or they cannot be saved in accordance with the teachings of the Scriptures and the creeds of Christendom. Unless this can be done Protestantism—yes, the entire system of Christian doctrine, breaks down.

The fault of modern Protestantism has been in neglecting the doctrine of salvation as a whole, with its *ordo salutis*, and in thinking too exclusively of the initial steps. Justification by faith was too exclusively in the minds of the early Protestants, and regeneration is unduly prominent in American Protestant Theology since the rise of Methodism, having taken the place of the older doctrine of Effectual Calling. It is not difficult to understand that the Divine Spirit may regenerate all the elect in this world, and plant within them the seeds of faith and repentance, so that redemption may have its beginning here for infants and incapables. We may also see this faith and repentance germinate and spring up under

the light of nature, and feel after God and His Christ in many among the heathen; but the redemption thus begun must in some way bring them to Christ in order that they may have the possession and enjoyment of salvation.

From the Arminian doctrine of probation and of human responsibility for the initiation of redemption, the first steps of regeneration must take place in the Intermediate State for all these persons or not at all. But from the Calvinistic position, which makes the divine grace prevenient, it is easy to hold that every elect person is actually regenerated in this life before he leaves the world. It seems that the birth of little children into this world would have no significance if they were not to have their regeneration here also. They must be born as children of Adam to take part in the ruin of the race, and it would seem that only the children of Adam have a share in the Saviour of the race. From this point of view Calvinism ought to have no hesitation in advancing into the doctrine of the Middle State. The salvation which is begun here by regeneration is carried on there. For the vast majority of our race who die in infancy or have lived beyond the range of the means of grace, their salvation begun in this life by regeneration is carried on in the Intermediate State with the exercise of personal faith in Christ, whom they know there for the first. There the germs of faith and repentance that have been put in their hearts in regeneration by the Holy Spirit spring up in the sunlight of Christ's own face, and lay hold of him as their Saviour. Not till then are they justified, for there can be no justification without faith for them any more than for others. The Intermediate State is for them a state of blessed possibilities of redemption. This is beautifully expressed in a hymn of Ephraim, the Syrian, translated by Professor Gilbert:

"Our God, to Thee sweet praises rise
From youthful lips in Paradise;
From boys fair robed in spotless white,
And nourished in the courts of light.
In arbors they, where soft and low
The blessed streams of light do flow:
And Gabriel, a shepherd strong,
Doth gently guide their flocks along.
Their honors higher and more fair
Than those of saints and virgins are;
God's sons are they on that far coast,
And nurselings of the Holy Ghost."

The Intermediate State is, therefore, for a considerable portion of our race a state for the consummation of their justification. The Protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone forces to this position.

IX. *Progressive Sanctification.*

But justification by faith belongs to the earlier stages of redemption. All those who are justified are also sanctified. No one can be ultimately and altogether redeemed without sanctification.

It is necessary that believers should have the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and that they should be "more and more quickened and strengthened in all saving graces to the practice of true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord," and "so the saints grow in grace, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." The doctrine of immediate sanctification is a heresy which has always been rejected by orthodox Protestants.

The Westminster Confession definitely states: "This sanctification is throughout, yet imperfect in this life." If imperfect in this life for all believers, there is no other state in which it can be perfected save in the Intermediate State. The Intermediate State is therefore for all believers without exception a state for *their sanctification*. They are there trained in the school of Christ, and are prepared for the Christian perfection which they must attain ere the judgment day.

I am well aware that it has been a common opinion that believers are at their death—that is, in the very moment of death, completely sanctified. This opinion seems to be favored by the statement of the Shorter Catechism—"The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness." (Quest. 37.) This is one of a number of instances in which the Shorter Catechism by its brief, unguarded statements has occasioned error. The Larger Catechism is fuller and clearer when it says: "The communion in glory with Christ, which the members of the invisible church enjoy immediately after death, is in that their souls are then made perfect in holiness, and received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory." (Quest. 86.)

The phrase "immediately after death" is the phrase of the question: "What is the communion in glory with Christ which the members of the invisible church enjoy *immediately after death*?" and it is designed to cover the *entire period* of the Intermediate State as distinguished from the state of resurrection, and it is not limited to the moment after death, in which the Intermediate State has its beginning. This is clear from Question 82, where the general question, "What is the communion in glory which the members of the invisible church have with Christ?" is answered in the follow-

ing three divisions of condition, which appear in three questions that follow: "The communion in glory, which the members of the invisible church have with Christ, is in this life, immediately after death, and at last perfected at the resurrection and day of judgment." It ought to be clear to any one that, having made sanctification a work of God's grace and a growth extending through the entire life of the believer and left incomplete at death, and that, having denied the doctrine of immediate sanctification, the Westminster divines could not be so inconsistent as to teach that at the moment of death, occurring at various stages in the growth in holiness, sanctification then changed its nature, ceased to be a progressive work, a growth, and became immediate, an act of God like justification. This would be to undermine the Protestant doctrine of sanctification. It is essential to the integrity of the Protestant system of faith that we should resist the Antinomian doctrines of eternal justification without faith and of immediate sanctification at any time or in any state or place.

There are some theologians who persuade themselves that they can believe in the immediate justification and the immediate sanctification of infants, of incapables and of heathen adults in the change of death, in that supreme moment of transition from this life to the Middle State. Such a theory may be stated in words, but it is inconceivable in fact. What a transformation would take place in the intellectual and moral powers of infants, incapables and the dark-minded heathen! Such a metamorphosis is not taught in the Scriptures or the Creeds. It would violate the intellectual and moral constitution of man.

Those who believe it may claim that all things are possible to God. But it might be said that it is just as possible for God to use the water of Baptism, *ex opere operato*, to work regeneration, as Sacramentarians believe; and it is just as possible that the elements of the Lord's Supper may be changed into the real body and blood of our Lord, as the Roman Catholics believe. These divine transformations are just as possible to God and just as credible to the mind of man as the immediate transformation of a little babe into a perfectly holy man in the image of Jesus Christ; or of the instantaneous accomplishment of the entire *ordo salutis* for an idiot in the very moment of death. All such magical doctrines are subversive of the entire structure of Protestantism. They belong to an age of magic, and have no place in an age of Reason and Faith.

It w
estanti
let me
else t
format
cally a
body.
ism wo
Protes
grace
moral
the est
Dorne
vines
in san
Protes
they
tency
opinio
by P
shoul
their
caugh
us bre
oursel
of the

The
ology
grade
to st
origi
natur
word
Spiri
pard
only
the a
whet
comm
those
they
brou
whet
the l
also
sins
as h
Nitz
Dor

T
sanc
th
mem
sanc
Chr
bro
fied
can
all
reac
com

It was a keen thrust of Möhler that Protestantism without a purgatory must either let men enter heaven stained with sin, or else think of an immediate magical transformation at death, by which sin mechanically and violently falls off from us with the body. Hase justly replied that Protestantism would not accept this dilemma, and that Protestant Theology taught that the divine grace was operative, and men capable of moral development after death. This view is the established opinion in German Theology. Dörner, Martensen, Kahnis, and other divines teach that there must be a growth in sanctification in the Middle State. All Protestants must accept this doctrine or they are sure to be caught in the inconsistency of magical, mechanical and unethical opinions. This opinion is commonly held by Protestants in Great Britain. Why should Protestants in America lag behind their brethren in Europe? We have been caught in the snares of recent errors. Let us break through the snares and re-establish ourselves in the ancient Christian doctrine of the Middle State.

The deeper ethical sense in German Theology since Kant forced divines to distinguish grades of sin and guilt and punishment, and to study as never before the psychological origin of sin and its development in human nature. Attention was thus called to the words of Jesus that the sin against the Holy Spirit was the only eternal sin, the only unpardonable transgression. This sin is not only unpardonable in this age, but also in the age to come. This raises the question whether any man is irretrievably lost ere he commits this unpardonable sin, and whether those who do not commit it in this world ere they die are, by the mere crisis of death, brought into an unpardonable state; and whether, when Jesus said that this sin against the Holy Spirit was unpardonable here and also hereafter, he did not imply that all other sins might be pardoned hereafter as well as here. This conclusion was reached by Nietzsche, Tholuck, Julius Müller, Martensen, Dörner, Schaff, and many others.

The doctrine of immediate justification and sanctification at death involves the conceit that the child who dies in infancy a few moments after birth is immediately justified and sanctified, receives saving faith and all the Christian graces in an instant; while his brother, who lives in this world, is not justified until he reaches the age in which he can exercise personal faith, and then he has all the struggles of life to undergo until he reaches the limits of human life without the comforts of sanctification, which he cannot

receive until death. If this were so, then blessed are those who die in infancy, and thus outstrip their fellows in the Christian race. Vastly better to be born to die, than to be born to live in this uncertain world. What parent would not prefer to lay all his children in an early grave, assured of their salvation, rather than expose them to the dreadful risks of life and the possibility of eternal damnation? According to the current beliefs, those Chinese mothers who put their children to death make more Christians than all the missionaries.

Overcome with such reflections, we might express our misery in the complaint of Job,

"Why died I not from the womb?

Why did I not give up the ghost when I came from the belly?

Why did the knees receive me?

Or why the breasts, that I should suck?

For now would I have lain down and been quiet, I would have slept; then had I been at rest."

The Christian doctrine of sanctification forces us to the conclusion that the Middle State is now and has ever been the school of Christian Sanctification. The Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory is a perversion of the true doctrine. It is mechanical and unethical, like other peculiar doctrines of the Roman Catholic system. But it is better than a blank agnosticism. There is much truth and some comfort in the midst of its errors, and it has profound consolation to offer to the bereaved and penitent. Here is one of its greatest strongholds. It is less mechanical and less unethical than the theory that has prevailed among Protestants that there is both immediate justification and immediate sanctification in the article of death.

The doctrines associated with Christian sanctification lead to similar results. Are the experiences of saving faith, assurance of grace and salvation, religious worship, the communion of saints confined to a few adult Christians in this life? Have they no meaning for the vast majority of the redeemed? Rather for the best of Christians the sublime truth and comfort involved in these doctrines are not realized until they enter upon the Middle State.

Those who hold the doctrine of immediate sanctification at death do not really understand the Protestant doctrine of sanctification and the principles of Christian Ethics.

Regeneration is an act of God and from its very idea is instantaneous, for it is the production of a new life in man. Regeneration is only one of the terms used in the New Testament to describe this beginning of Christian life. Resurrection is more fre-

quently used. Creation is also employed. Effectual Calling was preferred by the Westminster divines. All these terms indicate a divine originating act. Regeneration is always such, and cannot be otherwise.

But sanctification is the growth of that life from birth to full manhood, to the likeness of Christ. It is always in this world a growth; it is incomplete with the best of men at death. Does it change its nature then? Shall the little babe, the idiot, the seeker after God among the heathen, the Roman Catholic, the Protestant, and the saints of all ages, all alike in an instant leap over this period of growth, however different their stage of progress may be? Shall a babe become a man in an instant? Shall a savage become a philosopher in a moment? Shall a little boy become a John Calvin, and a John Calvin be conformed to the image of Christ, all at a divine creative word? Then the difference between regeneration and sanctification has disappeared for the vast majority of the redeemed.

If regeneration and sanctification are one act, how can we distinguish the intervening act of justification; and if regeneration, justification, and sanctification may all be one at death, why not in this life, as the Plymouth brethren teach? Why was the world turned upside down at the Protestant Reformation in order to discriminate justification by faith from sanctification if, after all these centuries of Protestantism, they are really identical for the vast majority of our race, and are only to be distinguished in those in Christian lands who live to maturity and become true Christians? Then Protestantism would be not only a failure, but also one of the greatest crimes in history. This is the pit of ruin into which the dogmatic divines of our day would force us rather than extend the light of redemption into the Middle State.

Those divines who confound sanctification with justification do not understand the principles of sanctification and Christian Ethics. Sanctification has two sides—mortification and vivification; the former is manward, the latter is Godward. Believers who enter the Middle State enter sinless; they are pardoned and justified; they are mantled in the blood and righteousness of Christ; and nothing will be able to separate them from his love. They are also delivered from all temptations such as spring from without, from the world and the devil. They are encircled with influences for good such as they have never enjoyed before. But they are still the same persons, with all the gifts and graces and also all the evil habits

of mind, disposition, and temper they had when they left the world. It is unpsychological to suppose that these will all be changed in the moment of death. It is the Manichean heresy to hold that sin belongs to the physical organization, and is laid aside with the body. If this were so, how can any of our race carry their evil natures with them into the Middle State and incur the punishment of their sins? The Plymouth Brethren hold that there are two natures in the redeemed, the old man and the new. In accordance with such a theory, the old man might be cast off at death. But this is only a more subtle kind of Manicheism, which has ever been regarded as heretical. Sin, as our Saviour teaches, has its source in the heart, in the higher and immortal part of man. It is the work of sanctification to overcome sin in the higher nature. We may justly hold that the evil that lingers in the higher moral nature of believers will be suppressed and modified with an energy of repentance, humiliation, confession, and determination that will be more powerful than ever before, because it will be stimulated by the presence of Christ and his saints. The Christian graces will unfold under more favorable circumstances than in this world. If it were possible that sanctification at death would make men so perfect in holiness as to remove all evil tendencies and habits, and not only destroy their disposition to sin, but so lift them above temptation that they would be not only like our Saviour during his earthly life, *posse non peccare*, but also like our Saviour after he had sanctified himself and risen victor over sin, death, and Satan, and attained the position of *non posse peccare*; even then they would only have accomplished the negative side of sanctification, the mortification or entire putting to death the old man of sin. They would still have to undergo the process of vivification and learn the *practice* of true holiness. What practice have infants and imbeciles when they enter the Middle State? How far short in practice do the best of men fall? Are they no longer to have an opportunity for the practice of true holiness? Will there be no chance to learn what true holiness is? The Middle State must, from the very nature of the case, be a school of sanctification.

X. The Reigning Christ.

It was a profound saying of Henry B. Smith that Eschatology ought to be Christologized. It is greatly to be regretted that he did not turn his own attention to that theme, and give us the fruit of his investiga-

tions. I subject Sin again not a few cations.

Christ man in the priest and years in the Middle centuries of his death and its us. Th to those his own departed gospel. his red he has him to a ber is no thing t lievers the mys teries an lation; able to is impr Luther as the that ha thers a teacher ing.

Chris They w his bloo commit positive has bee comple robe o have g their s with G great c But, termed reign Here k kingd from entire prepar they v world. The State. vestib

tions. Dr. Schaff gave his attention to this subject many years ago in his book on the Sin against the Holy Ghost, and has added not a few valuable hints in his later publications.

Christ is the mediator between God and man in the exercise of his offices as prophet, priest and king. Those who passed a few years in this world, and then went into the Middle State and have been there for centuries, have not passed beyond the need of his mediation. The interval between death and the judgment has its lessons and its training for them as well as for us. The prophetic office of Christ continues to those who are in the Middle State. After his own death he went to the abode of the departed spirits, and preached unto them his gospel. He ascended into heaven, taking his redeemed with him. All those whom he has purchased with his blood ascend to him to abide with him. The redeemed robber is not the only one to whom he has something to say in the Middle State. All believers enter his school and are trained in the mysteries of his kingdom. Those mysteries are not cleared up by a flash of revelation; they are revealed as the redeemed are able to apprehend them and use them. It is improbable that Augustine, Calvin and Luther will be found in the same class-room as the redeemed negro slave or the babe that has entered heaven to-day. The Fathers and doctors of the Church will be the teachers of the dead, as they taught the living.

Christ's priestly office continues for them. They who enter the Middle State still need his blood and righteousness. Even if they commit no positive sin they do not reach positive perfection until their sanctification has been completed in the attainment of the complete likeness of Christ. They need the robe of Christ's righteousness until they have gained one of their own. He is still their surety, who has engaged with them and with God to present them perfect in the last great day.

But, above all, Christ is a king in the Intermediate State. Here in this world his reign is only partial; there it is complete. Here his kingdom is interwoven with the kingdom of darkness. There it is apart from all evil and hindrance. His reign is entire over his saints, and they are being prepared by him for the advent in which they will come with him to reign over the world.

The Church is chiefly in the Intermediate State. The Church on earth is only the vestibule of it. In this world we have

learned to know in part the Messiah of the Cross; there in the Middle State the redeemed know the glory of the Messiah of the Throne. There the Church is in its purity and complete organization, as the bride of the Lamb. There Christ the head and his body the Church are in blessed unity. We have glimpses in the Apocalypse of the vast assemblies of the saints in heaven about the throne of the Lamb. And the Epistle of the Hebrews gives us a picture of their organized assembly on the heights of the heavenly Zion. It is important for the Church on earth to have a better apprehension of its relations to the Church in the Middle State. The Protestant branch of Christendom is weaker here than the Roman Catholic. It is high time to overcome this defect, for it is not merely agnosticism, it is sin against the mysteries of our religion. The modern Church ought to return to the faith of the ancient Church, and believe in the "Communion of Saints."

XI. Consistency of Christian Doctrine.

We have developed the doctrine of the Middle State in the light of other established Christian doctrines. If the Church has rightly defined these, then it results from them that we must take that view of the Middle State that they suggest. If we are not prepared to do this we cast doubt upon the legitimacy and competency of these doctrines. We confess them inadequate and insufficient. The Calvinistic system, with its principle that salvation is by the divine grace alone, and that this grace is ever prevalent, enables us to believe that the *ordo salutis* begins for all who are saved by the regeneration of the Holy Spirit in this life. This regeneration begets the seeds of a perfect Christian life. For some the *ordo salutis* makes no further advance in this life; for others it advances in different degrees and stages; but for all the redeemed the Middle State is of vast importance as the state in which our redemption is taken up where it is left incomplete in this life and then carried on to its perfection. This view of the Middle State gives it its true theological importance. It enables us to look forward with hope and joy for an entrance upon it. This life is an introduction to it. It mediates between death and the resurrection, and prepares for the ultimate blessedness.

We have thus far considered only the redeemed. Those who do not belong to that company also enter into the Middle State. But their place is a different one. It is represented as a prison, a place of destruction

and torment before the resurrection of Christ, in which they are reserved for the day of judgment. There is a silence on the fate of the wicked in the Middle State since the resurrection of Jesus that is profound and unbroken in the New Testament. The presumption is that their condition has not been changed by the resurrection, and that they remain in the prison-house of Hades. There are some who hold that there is a possibility of release from the prison house to join the company of the blessed. Such a hope would, indeed, be a comfort if it could be indulged for all mankind. But there seems to be no solid basis on which to rest it. The grace of God is so grand and glorious in its wonders of redemption that we may rest upon that as the solid rock of comfort. We gain more hope here than we can get from any other source whatsoever. We may be certain that when the final verdict has been rendered, we shall not be surprised that so many were not saved. But we shall rejoice at the wonderful extent and richness of the redemptive love of God in the unexpected multitudes of the blessed. And these will be not chiefly babes and imbeciles, but men and women who have undergone hardships in this life, and have overcome in its trials and temptations.

If we could find evidence in the Scriptures that there was any possibility of the extension of the benefits of regeneration and the efficacy of the means of grace into the abode of the lost, we should be glad to follow it. Or if we could see any evidence from other Christian doctrines that would lead to such a hope we would gladly embrace it. The Scriptures are not so decided against it as many suppose. The one passage with reference to Dives is not decisive for the present dispensation, and therefore does not shut the door of hope. The preaching of Jesus to the spirits in prison is not decisive for the present dispensation, and therefore does not open the door for a larger hope. Jesus by his resurrection made a change in the abode of the dead, by taking some of them at least with him from Hades to Heaven. We do not know what changes have been made in Hades in other respects.

The Arminian doctrine of *Probation* forces all those who believe in it to extend that probation into the Intermediate State. Sooner or later they will do it. But the Calvinistic system is in a very different position. The Calvinistic system solves the difficulties in a much better way. It does not limit the grace of God by human ability or inability. And yet there is nothing in Calvinism itself that prevents the extension

of redemption into a future life. In point of fact, Universalism sprang out of an extreme form of Calvinism. The grace of God might work in Hades as well as in this world. Regeneration might take place there as well as here, with or without the use of the means of grace. But we cannot escape the consideration that no one goes to Hades who has not been previously in this world, where the work of regeneration might have been wrought without waiting for the Middle State. If multitudes of infants and imbeciles are regenerated before departing from this life, why not also all others who are to be redeemed?

Let us heed the Saviour's warning, "Judge not that ye be not judged." We should cease damning our fellow-men and sending them to hell for difference of doctrine, of polity, and of mode of worship. Certainly if it rested with men, not one of us would ever see heaven. If the historic churches were to be the judges, they would empty heaven save of a very few ancient saints, and fill hell with historic Christianity.

If the judgment of the ecclesiastical authorities of the historic churches were ratified in heaven to-day, as they claim that they will be, every Christian now in the world would be excluded from heaven when he dies by the official decision of some one or more of the various ecclesiastical organizations that now govern the Christian world. What a *reductio ad absurdum* is the present opinion of Christendom on this subject!

The Messiah is at hand. There is a day of judgment that is hastening on. We are none of us prepared for it. Let us be thankful that there is a Saviour and a congregation of saints in the Middle State ready to receive us and prepare us for that day, and that when we depart this life in feebleness and imperfection we may be received into the company of the blessed, who will strengthen us and help us to climb the ascents of sanctification and glory.

CHEAP MISSIONARIES AND MISSION EDUCATION.

[A Reply to the article, "Cheap Missionaries," by Meredith Townsend, reprinted in our November number, pp. 93-97.]

BY PRINCIPAL MILLER, C.I.E., LL.D.

From *The Contemporary Review*, Oct., 1889.

It is a sign that the missionary movement has attained its majority when it begins to be treated as one of the forces by which the

future of
Mr. Mer
number
esting
to the
gracious
ance of
one wh
clusion
it. Sti
nings o
ful pul
rate ac
publicit
fidence
as liab
which
ishing,
ity of
as cha
should
ance w
a gene
ances
details
Mission
fallen
made
as the
Wit
the fi
curabi
man
again
Yet e
his st
of his
existi
missi
are r
count
esteem
aries
siona
caster
the r
such
hood
vails
be fo
mote
has
sions
dale
rega
well
life
Irel
that
asid
ston

future of mankind must be moulded. Thus Mr. Meredith Townsend's article in the July number of this REVIEW is specially interesting to those who have devoted their lives to the missionary cause. It may seem ungracious for one who welcomes the appearance of such an article, and especially for one who sympathizes with the broad conclusion it arrives at, to say anything against it. Still, it is important that the beginnings of criticism on missions by thoughtful publicists should be based on an accurate acquaintance with facts. There is no publicist in whose fairness I have more confidence than in Mr. Townsend's. But he is as liable as other men to fall into the errors which lurk in generalities. Nor is it astonishing, when account is taken of the rapidity of change in such phases of Indian life as change at all, that important elements should be overlooked by one whose acquaintance with Indian missions has depended for a generation on the unsympathetic utterances of secular newspapers and the small details which alone find place in ordinary Mission Reports. That Mr. Townsend has fallen into mistakes which could hardly be made by one acquainted with Indian missions as they are, it will not be difficult to show.

With the greater part of what he says in the first part of his article, as to the procurability of "cheap missionaries," every man who knows India and is not biased against missions will substantially agree. Yet even there he betrays the distance of his standpoint and the consequent vagueness of his knowledge. He ascribes much of the existing desire to screw down the income of missionaries to the jealousy with which they are regarded by ministers at home on account of the high place held by them in the esteem of congregations. "The missionaries are their heroes." "Morally the missionary caste is regarded as the Brahmin caste of the clergy—the best, the most tried, the most efficient." It is true that some such feeling existed in Mr. Townsend's boyhood, but it is the purest fancy that it prevails now. Doubtless some relics of it may be found by a careful seeker. In the remoter parts of East Anglia—if "Arcady" has become aware of the existence of missions—and in congregations far up Wensleydale or Swaledale, the missionary is perhaps regarded as a hero still. But those who are well acquainted with any form of church life in England or Scotland (for Protestant Ireland I cannot speak with certainty), know that such ideas have passed away. Setting aside a few like Selwyn, Duff and Livingstone, missionaries have long been regarded

by the bulk of ordinary church-goers as men who have gone abroad because they could not get a comfortable settlement at home. I believe there are few congregations in England, and I know there are none in Scotland, at least in any central situation, where an intimation that the services were to be conducted by a missionary, about whom nothing except his being a missionary was known, would not do immensely more to empty the church than to fill it. And about the way in which congregations regard men who wish to settle at home after a few years abroad, it would be easy to tell both pathetic and amusing stories. The contempt for missionaries is probably not so great as it was ten years ago. The pendulum is swinging back. In Scotland, at all events, it has begun to be recognized that missionaries have not all been driven to leave home, and that most of them are fairly on a par with the home pastors who were their class-fellows at college. But to say that they are regarded as superior to home pastors, or to deny that they have long been looked down on, is simply ludicrous to those who are in personal contact with church affairs. The notion of missionaries being overpaid arises directly from their being regarded as inferior articles, which are bad bargains if not got cheaply, infinitely more than in an inverted fashion from their being looked upon as "heroes."

It is another sign of how little Mr. Townsend is in contact with missionary societies, that he does not once look at the question of missionary salaries from the only point of view which churches and societies should take. For the question is not whether missionaries should be willing to endure hardship for the Gospel's sake, but whether Christian men should allow those who do their work for them to endure hardship which they can readily avert. Nobody doubts that it was noble of St. Paul to work on in penury and distress, and to support himself by the labour of his own hands. The only question is whether it would have been noble in the Philippian Church, which sent "once and again unto his necessity," to calculate when it made each remittance what was the smallest sum on which the Apostle could subsist until the next remittance reached him. So, too, in our day: it is admirable, and may sometimes be right, for men to go out as messengers of Christ, regardless of health and comfort, and surrendering for their Master's sake every earthly tie. But men who are called to this will act for themselves if they obey the call. Either they will have nothing to

do with missionary societies, or they will use what legitimately comes to them from societies for furthering their work and doing good; as I have little doubt that Paul did with a large proportion of his remittances from Philippi. The question for the society is not what is the missionary's duty, but what is its own. Now its plain duty is to provide its representative with such a portion of "the good things of this life" as, when his upbringing and general surroundings are taken into account, may set him free from pressing cares—let him make use of this provision as he pleases. I cannot conceive of any other answer being given by one who looks at the question of a missionary's allowances from the only point of view that befits the church which sends him. It is a point of view which Mr. Townsend never takes.

But I have no serious quarrel with the earlier part of the article. Mr. Townsend says a few things with which I do not agree, and lays stress on points which I regard as secondary. But, though I might travel by a different route, I should arrive at his conclusion—that by trying to obtain missionaries at the lowest possible figure, the churches will gain nothing "except the privilege of repeating an experiment which has been made half a dozen times and has invariably failed:" to which I should add that they will disgrace themselves and seriously damage their own spiritual life.

The case is different with the part of the article which deals with mission education. Mr. Townsend begins by stating two things: that he has no prejudice against Mission Education, whatever he might have in favour of it; and that he fully comprehends "the arguments which swayed Dr. Duff." As regards the first, few of us are good judges of our peculiar idols of the cane. I know of no journalist more free from intentional unfairness than Mr. Townsend; but old and appreciative readers of the *Spectator*, like myself, will scarcely hear without a smile of its accomplished editor being free from prejudice, if by prejudice be understood the tendency to judge things by an inner light which gives them a good deal of its own complexion. What I regard as Mr. Townsend's chief prejudices will appear as I go on.

As regards the second point, I do not admit that Mr. Townsend comprehends "the arguments which swayed Dr. Duff," and I think it will be admitted by but few of Dr. Duff's surviving friends. But on this question I shall not contend with him. He knew Dr. Duff long before I did, and possi-

bly he knew him better. One thing at least is clear, that he does not comprehend the arguments which sway those who are now doing the work Dr. Duff was the first to set practically on foot. On every page he shows that he has never heard of these arguments, or that he misapprehends them.

But this is not the place for setting forth such arguments. My present aim is simply to state some facts of which the article gives an erroneous impression or takes no account. To begin with—I do not know what Mr. Townsend believes, but certainly his readers will understand him to believe that the great bulk of missionaries in India are what he calls "tutor missionaries." (I fancy the nickname will stick. It marks well the qualified, not excessive, contempt and dislike with which average Anglo-Indians regard the class to which it is applied.) What are the facts, however? I have not the means of ascertaining how all the missionaries in India are employed. But in Southern India, that is, the Madras Presidency and the Native States geographically connected with it, the number of male missionaries from Europe and America has in recent years been between 250 and 300. I have taken much pains to determine the exact number at present labouring among the 50,000,000 and upwards of the South. Including those who are absent on furlough, I believe it to be 297. For two reasons, some trifling inaccuracy is possible. One reason is that some Nonconformist ministers devote a great deal of time to their own countrymen; so that it becomes hard to say whether they should be reckoned as missionaries or as pastors. The other is that some native clergymen have English names. Thus, I have not always been able to make perfectly sure about the birthplace of a certain Rev. Matthew Thomas or William Abraham. It is possible that I have unwittingly placed one or two natives on my list of American and European missionaries. But I believe I am literally exact in stating the number of such missionaries as 297.

I cannot speak so precisely about the number of female missionaries. I do not mean the wives of missionaries, but European or American women supported from home, as distinct mission agents. I have ascertained that there are considerably more than sixty such lady missionaries in Southern India, and probably about eighty. Let them be set down at seventy. This will make the whole missionary strength of Southern India, including all native agents, amount to 367.

Now most missionary bodies have taken something to do with English education.

Experi
cases
schools
only, o
country
non-H
of the
person
and se
time o
into d
streng
less th
tion o
Engla
Of the
little
school
know
withi
but ev
four
that,
every
Engla
aries
utmo
eight
is ge
Sout
educ
tentl
make
tire
lish
proc
colle
worl
give
part
are
if th
wer
how
ton
as p
ing
gar
thu
the
the
sco
fac
be
sio
TH
th
ed
Bu
he

Experience has led them to see (in some cases very slowly and reluctantly) that schools give them the best, and often the only, opening among the real people of the country—the Hindus as distinct from the non-Hindu elements in the population. But of the 297 male missionaries, only 41 are personally employed in English teaching; and scarcely any of these give their whole time or strength to it. If one were to go into details about fractions of time and strength, it would probably be found that less than thirty men represent the proportion of effective missionary power given to English education. Let that pass, however. Of the lady missionaries, a very few teach a little English to the advanced classes in the schools for native Christian girls. I hardly know whether their doing so brings them within the category of "tutor missionaries;" but even if it does, it will not add more than four or five to the number. The result is that, even when counting as an educationist every one who has anything to do with English education, out of the 367 missionaries of Southern India only 41, or, at the utmost, 45 or 46—in other words, about an eighth—are "tutor missionaries." Now it is generally, and correctly, supposed that the South is the part of India in which mission education is most developed. Thus one-tenth is as near an approximation as I can make to the probable proportion of the entire missionary force which is given to English education. Yet the article seems to proceed on the assumption that maintaining colleges is the only, or at least the main, work of Indian missionaries. Certainly it gives no indication of this being so small a part of what they do. Now many things are useful as a part which would be hurtful if they were the whole. If all missionaries were giving themselves to English teaching, however earnest its character or lofty its tone, I should join in denouncing the system as pernicious and absurd. But when teaching is so subordinate as it is, when it is regarded as auxiliary to other effort—and it is thus that all wise missionaries regard it—the question is entirely changed. That all the men of an army should be employed as scouts or pioneers would be foolish on the face of it. Does it follow that none should be so employed?

This whole question is one on which missionaries are the best, if not the only, judges. The position may conceivably be taken on theoretical grounds that it is wrong to use education as a handmaid to Christianity. But I think that this position will hardly be held by any one—surely least of all by Mr.

Townsend. And unless some such view be held, I do not see how there can be any better judges than missionaries themselves of the right extent and method of employing education in any given set of circumstances. Those engaged in doing a thing are likely to know best how to do it, whether the thing in hand be the building of a bridge or the Christianizing of a continent. On the question of education the missionary body in Southern India has spoken with no uncertain sound. Its last opportunity for discussing it was at the Conference held at Bangalore in 1879. There were 117 members of that Conference. Of these, 24 were native clergymen, while seven members came from Ceylon, and four from parts of India which I do not include in the term Southern India. The remaining 82 were a fair representation of the 260 American and European missionaries who, in 1879, were either at work in Southern India or on furlough. As at all such gatherings, the immense majority of the 117 were not engaged in education. It was judged wise, however, to entrust the drawing up of the deliverance of the Conference on this subject to men who could not be supposed to have any personal interest at stake. Here is the resolution *verbatim* which was framed by a committee, no member of which was a "tutor missionary." It was moved and seconded by men who were wholly identified with preaching work. No "tutor missionary" said a word about it. It was adopted by the Conference without modification and without a dissentient voice. It has been reprinted to satiety in missionary publications, but will be new to many readers of this REVIEW.

"RESOLUTION ON THE HIGHER EDUCATION."

"This Conference desires to express its full appreciation of high-class Christian education as a missionary agency, and its hopes that the friends of Indian missions will sympathize with this equally with other branches of Evangelistic work in this country."

"The Native Church in India needs at present, and will still more need in the future, men of superior education to occupy positions of trust and responsibility as pastors, evangelists, and leading members of the community, such as can only be supplied by our high-class Christian institutions."

"Those missionaries who are engaged in *vernacular work* desire specially to bear testimony to the powerful effect in favour of Christianity which these institutions are exercising throughout the country, and to record their high regard for the *educational work* as a necessary part of the work of the Christian Church in India."

"This Conference feels bound to place on record its conviction that these two great branches of Christian work are indispensable complements of one another, and would earnestly hope that they will be so regarded by the Christian Church, and

that both will meet with continued and hearty support."

If it were a deliverance of military men on a military point, or of doctors on some difficulty in practical sanitation, it would be accepted as settling the question. And if there were any large survival of the feeling of missionaries being "the best, the most tried, the most efficient" of the clerical order, I think it would be accepted as decisive, even on a missionary point.

Of course this deliverance left open, and was meant to leave open, all questions of detail. I have no dispute with those who hold that the proportion of mission strength spent on education should be a little less or a little greater than it is. Such points are always open to discussion. Opinions on them will vary, and ought to vary, according to varying circumstances. But the article before me means, if it means anything, that "tutor missionaries" were a mistake from the beginning, and ought to be utterly abolished. On that broad general question I must be excused if I prefer the judgment of those who are side by side with the educationists and know their work, to that of one who has had no experience of South India as it is on which to base his views.

But it is not missionary opinion alone that this portion of the article sets at nought. It contains a number of dark sayings which seem directly opposed to facts, or such an imperfect statement of facts as to be virtually opposed to them. I shall take one or two as specimens.

Education, we are told, "does not even improve India." "Nobody in India believes educated Indians to be better than old Indians of the same temperaments." I do not know whether this may have been true in Bengal thirty years ago, but certainly it is not true of the India I see around me to-day. Education has had disagreeable, and perhaps in a few points even bad, effects; but that it has vastly improved India on the whole, I did not know till I read this article that there was a sensible man alive who doubted. It would be vastly nearer the truth to say, "Everybody in India believes educated Indians to be better than old Indians." Let the opinion of men like Sir C. U. Aitchison or Sir W. W. Hunter, who are now in Britain, be asked on this point. In India itself I do not believe that a single administrative officer, old enough to compare things as they are with what they were before education had become so general, will hesitate to testify to the improvement that has taken place. From such men it is the merest commonplace to hear that the gen-

eral standard of purity and honour—the standard, for example, of the public service—though lower than it should be, is immensely higher than it was a quarter of a century ago. And it will be found that the standard is highest where mission education has been strongest, and lowest where education has been hardly in the hands of missionaries at all—as, for instance, in the country districts around Bombay.

These, it may be said, are but vague impressions. Let me give a single definite proof of what is believed in India. Seven years ago, a Commission was appointed to examine into Indian education. It consisted of twenty-one members, of whom not by any means all were educationists. Five were civil servants who were employed, or had been employed, as district officers. Seven were native gentlemen, Hindu or Mohammedan. Only three were missionaries, and one of the three was not an educational missionary. The Commission examined many witnesses in every province, and gave particular attention to the moral and social effects of English education. They did not conceal the darker side of things; but, in innumerable passages of their voluminous Report, they show clearly that, in their opinion, education had proved highly beneficial on the whole. A single extract may be given—not by any means the strongest, but perhaps the most carefully balanced that is short enough to quote:—

"The reformers of 1885, to whom the system is due, claimed that only by an education in English, and after European methods, could we hope to raise the moral and intellectual tone of Indian society, and supply the Administration with a competent body of public servants. To what degree, then, have these objects been attained? Our answer is in the testimony of witnesses before this Commission, in the thoughtful opinions delivered from time to time, by men whose positions have given them ample opportunities of judging, and in the facts obvious to all eyes throughout the country. And that answer is conclusive: if not that collegiate education has fulfilled all the expectations entertained of it, at least that it has not disappointed the hopes of a sober judgment."

That these twenty-one gentlemen, representing every shade of opinion and every class of the community, believed "educated Indians to be better than old Indians," is undeniable. Some of their utterances have been called in question; but I am not aware that what they said on this point has ever until now been challenged. Perhaps they would not all agree with me, but to my mind it is certain that the influence of Christian education, pervading in some degree the whole educated community, has been the chief cause of that moral growth the

existent
affirm
"Of
proof
reform
toms."
tive th
ed; bu
that t
trating
deeply
cent e
believ

But
in mo
about
of eva
ways
of tho
Churc
very s
in full
percei
hold t
that t
and n
pect
know
stand
kind.
ity m
work
judge
numb
reapin
could
of his
and c
effect
bring
acters
into t
any e
pecte
to th
obedi
and
thoug
make
strict
ted t
tribu
time,
has d
Gr
plent
desir
coun
proc
enorr
laye

existence of which they unanimously affirmed.

"Of the absence of altruism there is proof in the slight agitations raised for the reform of the more oppressive native customs." That these agitations are less effective than might be wished, will be conceded; but that they exist at all, and still more that they are steadily growing and penetrating the mass of Hindu society more deeply—are these not proofs of the beneficent effects of education and, as I at least believe, mainly of Christian education?

But even though there be improvement in morality, we have to face the dictum about Christian education that "as a method of evangelizing India it has failed, and always must fail." That comparatively few of those educated have joined the Christian Church I admit; and that few will join it very soon I am not prepared to deny. But in full view of this admission, and without perceiving any inconsistency in doing so, I hold that "the system" has succeeded, and that there is every sign of its being more and more successful. In saying so, I expect to be supported by every one who knows the facts and who judges by the only standards applicable in a discussion of the kind. For the success of any instrumentality must be judged by the nature of the work it is fitted to perform. Who would judge of the efficiency of a plough by the number of sheaves it could deliver, or of a reaping machine by the number of acres it could dig up? The wise farmer uses each of his implements in the appropriate way and expects his harvests from the united effects of all. Education is not fitted to bring men of immature minds, whose characters are only in process of being formed, into the organized Christian Church upon any extensive scale. At most, it may be expected to bring one here and another there to the point of breaking all human ties in obedience to a divine call. This it has done and is doing. But it is fitted to plant thoughts and awaken impulses which may make the work of the missionary, in the strict sense, tell more powerfully. It is fitted to make the soil good, and thus to contribute much towards securing, at the proper time, an abundant harvest. This also it has done and is doing.

Granted that the harvest is not yet so plentiful as the missionary and his society desire. It is possible to say much to account for that. The scale on which the process needs to be gone through in India is enormous; and the harvest has been delayed by the extent to which most mission-

aries have given their attention, not to the central mass of the population, but to the outlying sections which have been not at all, or very imperfectly, Hinduized. I do not mean to find fault with them for having done so. Still, the fact goes far to explain why Christian education has had a smaller visible outcome than was at one time expected from it.

But I conceive that those who believe in the government of God and in their own chief end being to carry out His purposes, have not very much to do with questions about rates of progress. For such, the great question is whether they are following the right road. The time of reaching their journey's end is a matter of subordinate importance. But then Mr. Townsend says that Christian education has not "given to the class affected any general bias towards" Christianity. This depends upon the sense in which the words are used. That educated Hindus have not much of a bias towards the open profession of Christianity is true. For some years, the general bias has been in a contrary direction. But if to have a growing apprehension of the majesty and power of what Christians have learnt from their divine Master be included in what is meant by a bias towards Christianity, then such a bias is plainly to be discerned. Some months ago, when the papers were full of Mr. Caine's attacks, a Hindu friend, many hundred miles from Madras, wrote to ask me whether there was any danger that missions would be induced to give up education. He deprecated their doing so in the strongest terms, and wondered what people could consider to be success if it was not success to have made, as he phrased it, "the spirit of Christ to prevail in India." I should not employ his phrase myself. It is but a dim adumbration of the spirit of Christ that prevails in India as yet. But that first faint streak is the certain herald of the dawn, and will be followed by the glories of the perfect day.

The fact is simply this. The educated men, or a large proportion of the educated men, in Southern India have come to set before them as the true model of life a not altogether distorted pattern of practical Christianity. They estimate rightly the moral fruits which Christianity produces, or tends to produce, in Christians. But as yet they have not generally learned that a living Christianity is the only tree on which such fruits can grow. At present they are for the most part struggling hard to believe that Hinduism, in some amended form, will produce all the fruits which they have

learnt to value. They are trying to read as much as possible of the truths and the spirit of Christianity into Hinduism. Of course the attempt is foredoomed to disappointment. But it is an attempt which it is natural for Hindus to make at the commencement of their religious awakening. It is an attempt which is a proof of their sincerity; and it seems to be a necessary part of the divine training that they should discover its futility *for themselves*. Thus, setting mere excrescences aside, the present state of feeling is at bottom a proof that the process of transition through which India must pass is going on healthily. To one who seeks mainly the enlargement and triumph of his particular church, the situation is certainly unsatisfactory. But to one who regards churches and societies as means towards spiritual ends, to one who puts the lasting good of India foremost in his thoughts and who cares chiefly about being the means of working out some part of the divine plan, it is full of encouragement and hope. It is a situation which many things have helped to bring about; but the chief of them has been the influence of missions, and of educational far more than of any other missions.

Of course to have awakened the leading element in the vast Indian community to a new ideal of life—to have set them to ask how this ideal can be attained, and in the first place to try to attain it by readjustments of their ancestral system—all this is a trivial thing, if one judges by the standard of numbers, or by the applause which visible success elicits from the Church and from the world. One would not expect, however, to find Mr. Meredith Townsend among those who reckon by these standards. Nor would he be found among them if he were in contact with the facts. Seeing from a distance, he sees nothing in young India but a generation "intoxicated with the sense of freedom" and which has lost "all originality." If he were seeing with his own eyes, he would see that while his charges contain a large amount of superficial truth, there are also many things at work which are signs and germs of deep moral and spiritual change. It is true that the change will not be completed soon, and that thirty years have not done much more than begin it. But lasting developments have tedious beginnings; and those whom God employs to effect them must exercise something of His own divine patience. They must learn to wait. But they can afford to wait.

But how is it that a sympathetic observer like Mr. Townsend has failed, even at a distance, to discern these joyful signs?

One reason is that in the province which he formerly knew, such signs are fewer and more faint than elsewhere. The divorce between knowledge and real thought, the inclination to value education merely as a means of getting on in life, the general shallowness and "bumptiousness," of which there is too much everywhere, are greater than anywhere else in Bengal. There, the germs of good are at their minimum and the disagreeable effects of education at their maximum. Other causes of the position taken up by Mr. Townsend might be given if I had space. One, however, is too important to be passed over. It is the attitude of the Anglo-Indian press and Anglo-Indian society. Whatever be the cause, it is well known that the tone of "society" in India is opposed to moral, and still more to definitely religious, work among the "natives." It is "bad form" to take a personal interest in the people of the country. Of course there are many exceptions. There are Civil servants, and military men, and lawyers, and merchants who have as genuine interest in the people as any missionary. But, however numerous, these are exceptions. The missionaries are the only Europeans who, as a class, are in living contact with the people, and who show clearly that it is on the people that their thoughts habitually turn. And of all missionaries the educational missionary most conspicuously violates the canon of aloofness from natives which "society" lays down. Most missionaries are in quiet rural stations; and even if fully in the public eye, are not so much identified with the class of natives with which ordinary Europeans come in contact. But the educational missionary is naturally located in some social centre and has to do with that pushing, restless, uncomfortable class—the "educated natives"—which "society" regards with a strange mixture of dislike, contempt, and apprehension. And the educational missionary has not only to do with this class, but treats them as men of like passions with himself. He is the personal friend of some of them; he argues with them on common ground, submits his judgment occasionally to theirs, laughs with them or laughs at them. "chaffs" them, loses his temper with them perhaps too often, but shows in his whole bearing towards them that he regards them as individuals with characters of their own, not as a mere class, to be trampled on or patronized as the case may be, but anyhow to be kept at arm's length. Thus "society" has a more pronounced quarrel with the educational than with any other missionary; and the

press
open
The
mini
made
magn
succe
his p
short
fulfil
They
wish
hono
gene
not
taken
there
tures
again
sion
says
is sl
bear
Thur
of C
ure,
line,
For
in a
come
quai
in I
of I
from
Indi
miss
exan
criti
quer
year
wha
Seld
who
path
mon
On
Con
hap
ing
ever
Chr
y
your
I dic
in th
imp
his s
miss
that
take
thin
ingl
line

press, which is the echo of "society," gives open expression to the quarrel with him. The newspapers pass over his successes or minimize them, and make all that can be made of his failures and mistakes. They magnify every trouble that his opponents succeed in raising into a total collapse of his plans. They deride him if he comes short of the most complete ideal, or fails to fulfil the most high-wrought expectations. They open their columns to every one who wishes to have a fling at him. There are honourable exceptions; but that this is the general tone of the Anglo-Indian press it is not possible to deny. Then the parable is taken up at home. The prevailing idea there being that missionaries are poor creatures, credit is given to all that is charged against them. And since educational mission work is that of which the Indian press says most, and that which in its very nature is slowest and least openly successful, it bears the main brunt of hostile criticism. Thus the idea is propagated that the work of Christian colleges and schools is all failure, at the very time when, along their own line, some of them are eminently successful. For it must be borne in mind that scarcely in a single instance do attacks on their work come from those who have an intimate acquaintance with it. They come from men in Britain who know nothing of the state of India. They come, though very seldom, from Christian men who have been long in India, but whose early prejudices against mission education have kept them from examining for themselves the thing they criticise. They come, a little more frequently, from earnest men who have been a year or two in the East, and who judge by what, as they imagine, things ought to be. Seldom, if ever, do they come from men who, whatever line of work they most sympathize with, have a wide experience of the moral and spiritual wants of the country. On page 133 of the Report of the Allahabad Conference in 1872, may be read how perhaps the most devoted itinerant or preaching missionary that the Church of England ever had in Bengal, spoke on the subject of Christian education:—

'With respect,' he said, "to the remarks of the young brother with the black beard, whose name I did not catch, I may state that, when I had been in the country as short a time as he has been, my impressions upon this subject were precisely what his appear to be. I was most strongly opposed to missionary schools and colleges; I looked upon that department of missionary labour as a great mistake. But although not a Scotchman, I am, I think, constitutionally a little cautious. Accordingly I determined not to say a word or write a line about what I thought or felt, I resolved to

wait and watch, and feel my way to an unbiassed conclusion; and now after more than seventeen years' close and careful observation, I have arrived at the deliberate conviction that my first impressions were *wrong*: that school work is a most valuable and important part of missionary agency, an agency that is largely contributing to the future glorious triumph of the Redeemer's cause in this land. I do not feel that I could myself engage in educational work; I am not fitted for it; but nevertheless I feel the highest regard for those dear brethren who are engaged in this work, and I do *not* think it to be, as some one here has described it, an easy work. It is in my estimation one of the hardest and most trying parts of missionary labour. We preaching missionaries have an actual enjoyment and even exhilaration often attending us in our work, to which the plodding school missionary is altogether a stranger. He is doing hard, heavy, and important work without any present reward. I honour him for it, and believe that he is doing God's work as really and truly as are preaching missionaries."

The prophecy implied in this was fulfilled. At the Conference of 1882, in Calcutta, I met the brother "with the black beard"—which was not then so black as ten years before—and found that he had become a thorough-going supporter of mission education. But the attacks that proceed from all the above classes taken together are much fewer than those that come from men who are opponents of all missions, or hopelessly ignorant of everything connected with them. In Southern India nearly every such attack is *anonymous*. It is so for the sufficient reason that if the writer's name were known, there would be considerable amusement at the idea of his posing as a critic of missions, or pretending to deplore their failure.

Take the Mission College in which I am employed. It is seldom that a long period elapses without articles or letters—sometimes whole volleys of them—decrying its character, misrepresenting its aims, glorying over, or professedly lamenting its failure. But many years have passed—more than a dozen, I believe—since any such newspaper attack was signed. Meantime, I do not know of one man, or at most of only one, in sympathy with other mission work, who can be justly regarded as an opponent of the college. There may be others, but I have never heard of them. Of course the college has its critics among men who sympathize with missions. Some think that it is too wide, and some too narrow; some that it attempts too much, and some that it attempts too little. Many perhaps are of opinion that it is not conducted so well as they would conduct it. But no institution that has a widespread and powerful influence should expect, or even wish, to be exempt from criticism of this kind. And of course the college is not all that might be

desired, or that it may yet become. The important question is whether, with all its real or supposed defects, it is not a powerful means of promoting the kingdom of heaven in Southern India. If even a single man who is known to value Christian work, and who is at all acquainted with the college and its influence, will say that it is not this, and say it *over his own name*, I shall begin to ask whether I have not misapplied the labour of half a lifetime—a question which for long years I have not felt any need to ask.

In speaking as I do, I may at all events be credited with sincerity. In any selfish point of view, it makes no difference to me if the salaries of missionaries be reduced to those of "Portuguese clerks" to-morrow. I have had openings enough elsewhere, and could enjoy life without taking advantage of any of them. I remain where I am because I know—let all the journalists of India deny it if they please—that I am promoting a very humble, yet an indispensable, part of what the purposes of God require to be done. Of course sincerity goes for little if a man be a fanatic or a fool. But even among the anonymous assailants whom the appearance of this reply will probably evoke in considerable number, I am confident that not one will describe me as a fanatic, and that only a few will write me down a fool.

Mr. Townsend concludes his article with a description of what, in his opinion, Indian missionaries ought to be. I am glad to be able to close my reply in complete agreement with him. There is room and urgent need that a small proportion should be employed in planting thoughts and stirring aspirations which Christ alone can satisfy, in moulding character so that it shall respond to the life and immortality which the Gospel has brought to light, in making the whole environment of the young Indian Church as favourable as possible to its speedy and healthy growth. Some, too, will continue, and should continue, to devote themselves to literary and industrial pursuits; and a few are needed to fill the post of Secretary or General Manager in the larger organizations. But the great bulk of Indian missionaries ought to be what Mr. Townsend calls "preaching bishops." There is no need to quarrel about the title he employs. Their noblest function is to organize, to stimulate and guide the efforts of as many native evangelists as they can.

But the extraordinary thing is how Mr. Townsend should be ignorant that what he describes as "preaching bishops" is exactly what the bulk of Indian missionaries are.

Except the few whom Providence has led along different lines, this is what they all aim at being. It is true there are not yet "a hundred" native workers for each of them to direct. And it is right, until time and strength are wholly taken up by such directing, that they should do, as best they can, something of the work of evangelists themselves. It is by doing it, even though with many drawbacks and failures, that they will learn how to direct those others whose birth and training will enable them, in the long run, to do it better. But what Mr. Townsend desiderates is what the vast preponderance of Indian missionaries wish to be, and what to a considerable extent most of them are. The fact that they largely are already what he maintains they should be, is the only thing that gives any plausibility to the absurd charges of luxury and self-indulgence which have been hurled against them.

Thus I can part from Mr. Townsend with gratitude for that appreciation of the right principles of missionary labour which underlies his mistaken antagonism to the particular form of work with which I am chiefly connected. I should be confident of his perfect sympathy with my own work if he knew better what the facts of missionary experience actually are, at all events in Southern India.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

BY REV. JULIUS HAPPEL, HEUBACH, SOUTH GERMANY.

(Condensed Translation from the *Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft*, IV. Jahrgang [1890] Heft. 3, by Rev. Charles C. Starbuck, Andover, Mass.)

I. ARE funeral rites connected with the religious faith of the peoples?

Almost universally, not merely from the indifferent, but from those attached to the Church, we hear it said that burial rites are no matter of faith; even very orthodox Christians are for cremation, etc. Is this true? Has the mode of disposing of the dead nothing to do with the Christian faith?

If it is improbable in itself that funeral rites have nothing to do with Christian, and indeed ecclesiastical life, still less probable is such a severance when we look abroad into the immeasurable sea of the religious life of general mankind, and on this basis

examin
nation

Such
yond
most i
faith o
fact v
in the

The
ligious
is show
Pesche
Hebri
when
requer
other
haust
ment
Willia
his w
Islan
moth
care
usage
Herol
irkson
and r
Davi
they
paren
he as
woul
impi
them
ship.

On
the
wild
starv
Bud
phil
bodi
you

E
dead
rari
mer
utte

T
wor
mer
the
pur
mer
fine
hig
enc
ear
sha
thi

examine the special question of Christian national life.

Such a look abroad shows it as a fact beyond question that the mode of burial is most intimately connected with the religious faith of the peoples, and that it is this very fact which explains the index differences in the mode of sepulture.

The deep influence of the peculiar religious faith, even among the wildest races, is shown strikingly by the fact, attested by Peschel ("Völkerkunde"), that, in the New Hebrides, and formerly on the Fiji Islands, when one was buried alive it was at his own request, that he might find himself in the other world in full strength and not exhausted by age. This mitigates our judgment of the scenes of horror described by Williams, when at the funeral of a Fiji chief his wives were strangled. On the Loyalty Islands, if a beloved child was buried, the mother or an aunt was killed, to have the care of it. Not widely unlike were the usages of those Eastern peoples described by Herodotus, who, to save their parents the irksomeness of old age, put them to death and reverently consumed their flesh. When Darius I. asked some Greeks at what price they would devour the flesh of their deceased parents, they answered, At no price. When he asked certain Indians at what price they would burn them, they cried out against the impiety. What the Greeks abhorred was to them the deepest sign of affectionate fellowship.

On the other hand, Buddhism, despising the body, often praises its committal to the wild beasts. Buddha's self-sacrifice to the starving tiger-cubs is almost the heart of Buddhist tradition. In like manner, Greek philosophers asked how they wished their bodies to be disposed of, answered: "As you will."

Even so, Stoic Pantheism, viewing the dead body from which the allsoul, temporarily individualized by it, has departed, as mere excrement, teaches its disciples to be utterly indifferent as to what becomes of it.

To have carried the idealistic view of the world to its height seems to have been the merit of the Indian philosophy. Therefore the Hindus burned the body, that Agni, the pure god of fire, consuming its grosser elements, might invest the departed with a refined vehicle of existence, suitable to his higher and more spiritual mode of existence. Therefore the Rig-Veda says: "This earthly fire is the one thing, next thou shalt find the second, unite thyself with the third."

In most significant contrast with this de-

materialization of the world, impelling religious faith to cremation as its most expressive figure of immortality, stands burial in the earth, which has established itself everywhere that men believe in a resurrection, regeneration, and renewal of the world. This thought was expressed by the yearly return of death and life in the changing seasons. The earth, therefore, is the all-receiving and all-renewing mother of all living germs and beings. "When I was curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth," says the Psalmist. The Parsees suppose a lake, in which all germs are thus guarded. The Druids and the Eleusinian mystagogues, teaching that death is a renewal, by the power of Mother Earth—Demeter—into a higher form of life, required the Demetrioï, the Initiated, to be not burned, but buried, shooting forth as germs of immortality.

Earth burial, therefore, as Quenstädt admirably demonstrates, was in antiquity regarded as the original, because most natural form of sepulture. Therefore tradition makes out the earliest patriarchs, biblical or legendary—Cecrops, Numa, Moses, Abraham, and Adam—to have been buried. And so the Christian Church, as the Fathers bear witness, has returned to the most original and most natural use.

Gregory Nazianzen beautifully names men "twice buried," because they first lie in the womb covered and, as it were, buried, before they are born into life, until they shall again be awakened into life eternal. Heraclitus, teaching that all things come from fire, insists that the body shall be dissolved by fire. But Quenstädt, remarking that God's Spirit has taught us more justly that our body was framed of earth, shows that by Heraclitus' own rule it ought to be committed to the earth.

The realistic Chinese are the strictest in their adherence to earth burial. Viewing the earth as the territory of the dead, they are unwilling to have it disturbed by the laying out of railroads, etc.

Yet, on the other hand, earth and fire might appear too holy to admit of the committal of corpses to them. Therefore the Zoroastrians of old, as Persians and now as Parsees, permitted neither mode of sepulture. Formerly they exposed the dead on mountain-tops or towers, to be devoured by dogs kept for the purpose, and called eutaphists, buriers. Now they expose them on high scaffoldings to decay or to be devoured by vultures, lest the holy elements, the work of the good God, Ahuramazda, should be defiled by their corruption, which is by Zo-

roastrianism regarded as a work of the evil spirit.

And so, among ninety-nine one hundredths of the human race it can easily be proved that the mode of sepulture coheres with the religious faith. The remaining one one hundredth therefore admits of an easy induction to the same effect.

From the examples already given, which have been chosen especially for their significance, and which could easily be multiplied, we see how intimately the religious faith of the peoples coheres with the sepulture of the dead. Two points especially appear to stand out firm and clear: The mode of sepulture is determined: (1) by the religious faith in general; (2) by the peculiar form of the belief in Immortality in particular. But most widely, deeply, and completely is it determined by the peculiar principle of religious morality in the national life, as must now be shown.

Among the so-called nature-races (*Naturvölker*), whose life is still imprisoned in sense, who view the future existence as merely a continuance of the present, after its interruption by death, to be spent under the earth, in heaven, in the air, etc., there is generally the largest allowance as to the form of sepulture, it being indifferent whether one arrives at his appointed place through fire, earth, air, or some other element, while a reference to beauty, seemliness, human dignity, and especially to deeper religiousness or purer morality is as yet entirely out of the field of view. Things are quite different on the standing-point of the more refined development and cultivation of the feelings and sensibility. Here there are fewer and fewer indifferent forms of human action. Every action has now its definite stamp, religious and ethical, internally and externally; it must be accommodated to the moral principle, the moral norm, by which all actions on this stage of religion and culture are pervaded.

People who imagine that the question of sepulture has nothing to do with the religious belief of Christians ought to be examined as to whether they hold the funeral usages of Buddhism or Parsism to be permissible for Christians. I cannot see what exception could be taken from their point of view to keeping animals on corpses; of course only as an option—*e.g.*, if any one would like after his death to be devoured by his own hound.

It was a school-boy argument, not to say one implying naïve ignorance, when lately, in a discussion of the question in a German legislature, it was represented that the

Greeks were a refined and highly cultivated people, and yet that they found in cremation nothing unesthetic or opposed to religious and ethical feeling. Plato and Aristotle have also given their approbation to slavery, polygamy, nay, even to unnatural love; shall we Christians therefore reintroduce these also? And, again, would it have seemed the Greeks and Romans and other cultivated peoples of the ancient world to have dealt with their dead like the rudest barbarians? Or would it be suitable for us Christians to define our conduct by the principle which defined the religion and morality of even the highest peoples of culture in the ancient world?

Upon the naturalistic position of the heathen peoples, on which man was not regarded as anything specifically distinguished from the brute, where man too claims no other place than that of a product of nature, and was not honored as an ethical personality created in the image of God, where the slave and woman might yet be handled as a thing, a commodity, there either burning or interment might be regarded as of equal value as a return to Mother Nature. At a time when (as can be proved even of the Greeks and Romans of the classical era) men yet held it lawful to bring human sacrifices and bury them alive to propitiate the subterranean gods, or to burn them, then, doubtless, cremation or interment might as yet be equally significant, and a wide variation in the treatment of the dead equally admissible.

This state of things necessarily changed at one stroke by the words: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness!" Man is not a product of Nature like other creatures, but *personally* created by God. Through this *personal* creation of man by God, man became, in soul and body, something specifically distinct from the mere animal.

And here Christianity has interposed, inasmuch as it will have the human body held and honored as the temple of the living God. Not only the members of the soul, but those of the body are to be instruments of the Holy Ghost. Here the body also is no more the man's own, to do as he will with it, but Christ's own, who shall transform the body of our humiliation (therefore not as by fire) that it may be fashioned like unto his glorified body (Phil. iii. 21).

On this new and higher Christian level of apprehension of God and the world, therefore, the sepulture of the dead must also become new in form and substance.

I. For, as the result of our argumentation,

we have
is so in
belief
religio
lief in
more s
pure—
the fo

It is
is the
moral
Or, is
hither
which
princ

Le
Not
term
the c
ture.
of se
tians
prop
toug
reve
men
the
fied

I

is t
frui
life
reg
As
bu
ris

be
de
tia
ne
G
as
ne
li

...
d
a
t
...
q
7
v
l
c

we have seen that *The Sepulture of the Dead* is so intimately conjoined with the religious belief of the Peoples, that the more spiritual, religiously deep, and morally pure the belief in immortality becomes, so much the more spiritual, religiously deep, and morally pure—in a word, the more ethical, must also the form of sepulture become.

It is consequently, II., the question, *Which is the Form of Sepulture required by the moral principle of the Christian religion?* Or, is the ecclesiastical usage of interment, hitherto practised, the form of sepulture which alone answers to the specific Christian principle?

Let us first specify this form more nearly. Not interment simply, nay, not merely interment (for the body is sometimes given to the deep), is the Christian mode of sepulture. For interment occurs also in forms of sepulture wholly inadmissible to Christians. But such an interment as most appropriately expresses the Christian belief touching death and resurrection; the most reverent treatment, envelopment and interment of the human body, as representing the sown seed, out of which the new, glorified, and yet identical body is to proceed.

In the parable of the corn of wheat,

"Which living dies,
"And dying lives,
"Slumbers and wakes again,
"Falls into earth, and rises up therefrom,"

is transfigured, renewed, and brings much fruit, the deepest mystery of the Christian life, its most central process, the mystery of regeneration, of resurrection, is set forth. As we die in and with Christ, so are we also buried in him and with him, so also do we rise again in, with and through him.

Even our baptism signifies a burial, a being buried with Christ by baptism into death and by a living burial. But we Christians bury a living seed, no rigid mummy, no dead ashes, but a seed of God, a plant of God, which is planted in God's field. "For as we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection."

"Therefore," says Andrew (295, 296), "the early Christians named the day of death *Natalitia*, and they commonly wrapped a corpse in fine white linen, as if renewing the day of baptism."

Resurrection is not a mechanical process of combustion and annihilation, but an organic process of life, therefore are we sown. The seed is hidden in the earth, as in the warm maternal bosom, for all living things. Here it sinks back into an embryonic condition, sleeping like a child in the womb,

for a joyous waking and blossoming. And if any one says, How? the apostle's answer is: Thoughtless one! what is sown must die to live.

For this very reason it is precisely the process of corruption which is so striking a figure of the Christian idea of dying and rising again, because corruption (but not burning) represents the special sentence of death passed against the old, outward, earthly man. The old, outward, earthly man, made out of the earth, is the husk of the new, interior, heavenly man, of heavenly descent. The former, as the husk of the seed, is made of earth, therefore weak, futile, perishable, resolved again to earth. But the seed of God hidden under this husk, the real (incorporate) divine image, in distinction from the ideal, formal divine image, prefigured in the first, in the elementary man, shall be released from death's fetter, from the weight of the grave. Thus, there is a sowing in corruption and a rising again in power. There is sown a natural body, there rises again a spiritual body.

Christianity teaches a duplex death; the former comes to pass through *corruption* (becoming earth); and to this all natural and sinful men are subject (exception: the saints shall not see corruption); the second comes to pass through *FIRE*; it is at the end of the world; it is a death of annihilation, when death annihilates all perishable being and also itself.

The process of corruption, therefore, also represents a sentence of death, indeed, even a sentence of eternal death; but the latter only for those who bear about them nothing but what is corruptible; while for those transplanted into the heavenly range of life there is a dying and sinking to earth by necessity of nature, that so the new man can rise again out of this. Corruption (mouldering away) is also a process of combustion, only a slow one, and therefore a process of life.

If the natural, earthly, material kernel can pass through the process of corruption, without harm to the living germ, enclosed in the husk, the germ of pneumatic life, the seed of God, which the regenerate man bears in himself, then first shows its capacity of outlasting not only the first, but also the second death.

Had the man who is laid in the grave been during his life nothing more than chaff, this, it is true, would be most vividly expressed by combustion.

Cremation (I do not say *Fire*) is for us Christians the symbol of Hell. The chaff shall be burned up with unquenchable fire.

On this ground, in the Christian Church, heretics were burned.

Not the blessed, who die in the Lord, but the absolutely reprobate, or (according to 1 Cor. iii. 15) the not yet converted must pass through the fire, and, like Dives, suffer torment in the flame.

We do not here overlook the fact that fire in and of itself by no means symbolizes merely a process of annihilation, but also one of purification and glorification, an ennobling process, as we, indeed, have already seen to have been true of the Hindus and Germans. But it was so to them, as it cannot be to us, because they, as seen especially in Buddhism, accounted the palpable human body as something evil, to be put away, while Christianity accounts it as something good, appertaining to the true, abiding, eternal human nature. The flesh and blood of man is the basis of his individuality: therefore the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. Therein is the concrete image of God, in its individual manifestation, expressed.

The human body, even the material, is, according to Christian apprehensions, no mere slag, which is parted from the soul by fire, like dross from gold, but is itself a piece, part, member of human nature, as being in the image of God, which, taken together with the soul, then only constitutes the whole man, and is therefore not to be resolved into the elements, but is to be re-animated and glorified. That which is to be separated from man and annihilated, that from which his body and soul are to be purified, is not the earthly and palpable matter, but evil, which is purged off by spiritual fire (of affliction), through burning while yet alive, this genuinely Christian self-cremation, through the chemical process of conversion and sanctification. Therefore a self-cremation—i.e., a voluntarily chosen fiery death as a martyr for the Christian faith, would correspond very well to the constitutive moral principle of the Christian religion; and so far the Hindu suttee, as also an analogous use of the old Germans, is a manner of death and sepulture far more nearly approximate to the Christian idea, than the mere disposal of the corpse by means of a furnace, which brings vividly to mind a statue of Moloch or a chemical laboratory, or indeed a mere druggist's still.

III. Conclusion. The Eternal, Spiritual Essence of Christianity and the Mode of Sepulture.

In this question also the weightiest fact, which at the same time constitutes the specific and distinguishing glory of Christianity

above all other religions, is the independence of Christianity (and therefore of the Christian faith in the Resurrection, but not of Christians), as the religion of the Spirit, from everything visible and transitory, therefore also from any particular form of sepulture. This spiritual nature of Christianity is already set forth in the Johannean writings with unsurpassable clearness. The words: "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. . . . My words are spirit and life. He that was from the beginning, the Life. . . . I am the Resurrection and the Life . . ." are written from an elevation to which things terrestrial and transitory do not attain.

But although Christianity is independent of the mode of sepulture, Christians are not. Our conscience, enlightened by God's word and sharpened by the Holy Spirit, must teach us to prove and distinguish what is of the world and what of God, that we may, over against wavering opinions and the shifting ideas of various ages, correctly maintain the eternal principle of Christianity, without violating Christian love and truth.

Now, the biblical passages cited above, where we were speaking of Interment as the most exact symbolical expression of Christian faith in the Resurrection, show most distinctly in what a deep-reaching connection the peculiar belief as to Immortality, not only of the Old Testament but also of the New, stands with burial in the earth, and that interment is not only to be held fast as that which most strikingly symbolizes the Christian faith in the Resurrection, but also because (likewise according to the early Christian view) the preliminary home of the dead appears to be, not in heaven, but in the earth.

For there is much matter of thought in the passage (Matt. xii. 40) according to which the Son of man was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth; and out of "the dead," not "out of death" (as is commonly said), did the Lord rise. Shall we therefore, after our earthly decease, also be in the heart of the earth, among the dead, in Hades, in the realm of the dead?

In view of the obscurity, and yet urgency of the great enigma and its anxieties, which unites the biblico-ecclesiastical faith in the Resurrection with its "already in heaven," and yet also "rise again at the last day," it is so much more to be counselled that we should not arbitrarily abandon the traditional mode of sepulture, and set in its place a form of sepulture belonging to an altogether different circle of ideas.

Crem
of Bud
world;
the soil
their af

All
growth
spiritus
peoples
longer

This
of inte
in the
ples, I
transm
not po
a mere

And e
even a
mecha
infect
by the
health

Her

uttera
fulfil.

mode
mode

settin
in the

hesita
baris

Gree
rude

Ev
still

in de
pose

juric
no lo

of th
we h

of si
idea

W
bur

did
to d

poi
to i

tion
the

no
and

also
wh

V
bri

as
ide

It

Cremation has its true place on the soil of Buddhism, with its denial of the real world; but is inorganic, heterogeneous on the soil of Hebraism and Christianity, with their affirmation of the real world.

All national usage (*Sitte*) is an organic growth out of the collective, natural, and spiritual life of a people or a community of peoples, and this the more certainly the longer and more universally prevalent it is.

This applies very especially to the usage of interment, which originated so long ago in the midst of the life of the Christian peoples, has become universal, and has been transmitted through so many ages. It cannot possibly be inorganic—*i.e.*, spring out of a mere unreflecting habit, a caprice of mode. And even if it were an hereditary disease, even a disease is not to be healed in a purely mechanical way, by a mere removal of the infectious matter, but only organically—*i.e.*, by the substitution of better conditions of health.

Here, if anywhere, belongs the pregnant utterance: "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil." If cremation (especially in the modern form) were actually a more perfect mode of sepulture—*i.e.*, one more exactly setting forth the idea of the Christian faith in the Resurrection, then we would without hesitation pass over to it. But it is a barbarism, by which we not only sink below the Greeks and Romans, but sink among the rudest peoples, the children of mere nature.

Even among the most savage peoples it is still a *higher idea* which has been controlling in determining how the dead should be disposed of; all other grounds of utility or injuriousness had to yield to that; and is this no longer to be the case among us Christians of the nineteenth century? Can it be that we have become so rude that we set reasons of simple temporal utility above the higher idea—that is, the Kingdom of God?

When the Greeks, Romans, Germans burned the corpses of persons of rank, they did this for the sake of the higher idea—*i.e.*, to distinguish them thereby; and from their point of view—*i.e.*, their peculiar beliefs as to immortality, this was in fact a distinction. But we Christians stand no longer on the platform of the Greeks and Romans, we no longer make a distinction between gods and demigods, men and half men; and have also a higher conception of immortality, of which they as yet knew nothing.

When Jacob Grimm says that we cannot bring back the now antiquated use, this is as much as to say we cannot bring back the idea which lay at the basis of cremation. It is not cremation, as such, as an external

usage that is heathenish, but the religious belief therein incorporated. To this we cannot give renewed life.

The following propositions in conclusion:

(1) Interment is a primitive Christian use, which ought not to be impugned without necessity, and should only be handled with the greatest and most forbearing caution, although it may well be developed and perfected.

(2) It is interwoven with the whole circle of Christian thought and feeling, as shown in popular poetry, spiritual and secular, church ordinances, legislation, etc.

(3) It is evidently the most striking symbolization of the specifically Christian faith of the Resurrection, and touches upon the deepest mystery of the Christian faith.

(4) The constitutive moral principle of Christianity requires fulfilment, not abrogation; perfecting, not destroying; elevation and ennobling, not debasement and searing of religious and ethical feeling. Now, Cremation, which is proposed instead of the ancestral Interment of the Church, implies the searing of the religious and ethical feeling, and a submersion of it into a lower morass of barbarism than is found among the most barbarous of savages.

BROTHERHOODS OF THE POOR.

BY VEN. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER.

From *Murray's Magazine*, London, October, 1889.

WE have recently witnessed a strike which must be regarded as one of the most remarkable in modern times. It began among the lowest, most despised, and most down-trodden class of unskilled labourers—a class which has been proverbial for misery and poverty, and for the struggle of many to secure the scantily-paid toil which can only be allotted to the few. Beginning among two or three thousand dock-labourers, it extended like the spread of a conflagration, till, in an incredibly short time, more than a hundred thousand men were on strike. London was overawed by a multitude marching through her streets more numerous than many an army which has conquered kingdoms. Her trade, which is the astonishment of the world, was for a time paralysed. Hundreds of vessels lay idle in her docks and her great river, which were able neither to ship nor to unship their loads. Tens of thousands of pounds were

lost every day. In the East-end of London streets were deserted and wharves were empty. Two circumstances of the strike were specially memorable. One was that though myriads were suffering from the stress of hunger, and saw the pinched look on the faces of their wives and little children, and could only look forward to a future of terrible uncertainty, they yet abstained from acts of violence; and the leaders in whom they trusted were men who faithfully dissuaded them from every revolutionary measure to which they might have been goaded by the maddening stress of want. Another fact, full of the deepest significance for the future, was that the vast majority of the men on strike had no personal grievance. They acted on motives which, whether they were founded on mistaken views or not, were certainly full of chivalry, brotherliness, and self-denial. Though many of them were receiving high wages with which they were perfectly satisfied, they made common cause with the poor dockmen, and went out on strike;—a course which as they well knew might not only cause them present inconvenience, but might even imperil their future interests. They faced the risk with a generous desire to secure higher wages and less galling conditions for their suffering fellows.

When the strike was drawing to a close I received a letter from a workingman, a perfect stranger, whose name even was unknown to me, entreating me in warm terms to express my sympathy with the troubled and excited workers of East London. It may be worth while to record how the strike presented itself to an evidently honest and intelligent young artisan who had no personal share in it. He wrote as follows:

"I beg in all faith and honesty to ask your aid in the present crisis of the strike. In the first place I am sure their cause is just, as I have had seventeen years' knowledge of them and their work. Mr. J. Burns, their champion and leader, is much loved and trusted by them. He is a total abstainer and non-smoker, and has formed them into a band of brothers ready to suffer any pains for the right. What the men now want to keep them together is a great spiritual leader. Mr. Burns has stirred up in them chivalric qualities hitherto undreamed of. Now is the time to arouse their spiritual faculties. I sympathise with them, heart and soul, as you would do if you could only see half the sacrifices they make for honour's sake. I have never seen the spirit of right and chivalry so stirred in them before. I feel certain that this is an opportunity to touch their souls. Will you not write a letter to their organ, or speak at their next meeting?"

I felt the force of the appeal, but for two reasons I was unable to take any step in the matter. The first was accidental. I had

been travelling from the North of Ireland to the depths of Eskdale, where I was at a distance from any post. The letter was consequently delayed in transmission; and when I received it a week had elapsed since I had read a newspaper, and I did not even know whether the strike was over or not. The other reason was different. I saw that in hundreds of instances strikes had proved fatal to the best interests of the working-men themselves. Sometimes strikes had been defeated, leaving behind them a long trail of indigence and misery. Sometimes they had succeeded, and their success had done worse harm by permanently disturbing the delicate relations between capital and labour; by causing great works to be closed, and so throwing multitudes out of permanent employment; and—which was the most fatal result of all—by driving important industries entirely out of the kingdom, and thus proving a benefit to other countries at the expense of our own at the very time when the strain of international competition is becoming constantly more severe.

A clergyman ought instinctively to regard himself as a champion of the poor and the oppressed when their cause is just. Christ was a poor man among the poor. He chose for His lot on earth the shop of the carpenter and the boat of the fisherman. He pronounced his beatitude upon the lowly, and invited to Himself the heavy laden. But one whose function is that of a religious teacher is specially bound to do nothing rash. The very sympathy which he feels with the unfortunates should check him from encouraging any action which may tend in the long run to ruin the interests which he desires to serve. The strike of the dock-labourers raised questions which perplexed the wisest philanthropists and the profoundest political economists; and it was impossible for one who was not upon the spot, and had made no special study of the whole question, to take any active part by thrusting himself with insufficient knowledge into a struggle of which the ultimate issues appeared to be so momentous.

But the phenomena of the strike ought to bring other considerations very forcibly home to the minds of all who love the Church of England, of all who believe in the faith of Christ.

For every one, I think, will admit that neither the Church of England nor any other religious bodies went for much in the mind of those hundred thousand working-men. Cardinal Manning did indeed produce a deeply favourable impression, and is always foremost in every good social work.

His influence was nothing short of a national boon, and the Bishop of London seconded the noble effort of the Cardinal. But with this and one or two other exceptions, neither as corporate bodies, not by the action of their individual members, did any of the sects or churches wield any potent influence over this vast social movement. No one referred to them; no one consulted them. The leaders of the great associated strike were not in the least recognizable by their adherence to any special form of religious belief. No one ever dreamed of calling in the intervention of Bishops or any body of Church dignitaries or Dissenting ministers to act as arbitrators. Of the hundred thousand artizans who demonstrated in Hyde Park, or paraded the streets of the East-end, it is very doubtful if ten per cent. regularly attended any Christian assembly, or acknowledged the immediate authority of any religious community. By the confession of the Church of England, and of all other Christian bodies, the working-classes as a whole have "lapsed" or drifted away from the influence of the Church.

Do we realize what that means?

It does not mean that the working-classes as a whole are godless, but it does mean that they have cut themselves loose from many of the best aids and incentives to godliness. It does not mean that they hate religion, but it does mean that in the current forms of religion they do not find the blessings and consolations which are the best support and the richest boon of life. It does not mean that they have no hope and are without God in the world, but it does mean that they lose the divinely appointed way of keeping God ever before them, and that their hopes are in constant danger of being drowned in the muddy and shallow deluge of daily misery and struggle.

Ought we to be content with this state of things? Are we doing our duty if we make no effort to recover the lost ground and to keep pace with the rising tide of population?

Optimists will say, "We have the Parochial system, and the clergy were never more active than at present."

Few men have a higher estimate of the value of the Parochial system than I have, but I must say plainly that if we consider it adequate to the needs of these days we are under a complete delusion.

The working of the Parochial system is admirable for the requirements of the ordinary pastorate. Nothing better could be devised for ministrations to those who are

faithful members of the Church. But it is not evangelistic, it is not aggressive. In thousands of parishes it breaks down quite hopelessly, partly because their numbers are so unmanageable that most of the parishioners never see their clergyman at all; partly because in great cities the parochial unity has been absolutely obliterated. What are we to say of parishes of ten, or even twenty thousand people who do not and will not contribute enough to pay for the warming and the lighting of their own church? who refuse to subscribe as much as £10 a year to maintain their own schools? who allow their struggling and burdened vicar to provide out of his own pocket the stipends of the curates whom he is forced to engage, not to lighten his own labours but to meet the spiritual needs of his people? What are we to say of parishes of many thousands, under good and able men, which yet cannot muster more than a handful of communicants, and cannot send up more than a dozen or two candidates for confirmation? England is becoming a nation of great cities. There are parishes which in ten years have quintupled their population. If we trust to the Parochial system alone to maintain the cause of religion among these teeming multitudes we are leaning upon a broken reed. Much too of what is vaunted as the increased activity among the clergy is purely functional. It consists in the multiplication of services and the elaboration of ceremonies. If a clergyman has daily service, it is supposed that he *must* be doing good work. Yet what is the practical value of the daily service, when, after being fully tried for years, the entire congregation consists (as I have known to be the case) of a single idiot, sitting with a book before him upside down; or of the bell-ringer and two old women; or of four young ladies, the daughters of the vicar; or of the schoolmaster alone, so that, as one vicar said to me, "I daily read the service to the congregation, and the congregation reads the lessons to me"? Functions, and ceremonies, and services may be admirable in their place, but they will never do the work achieved either by St. Paul, or by Francis of Assisi, or by Wesley and Whitefield. Our Sunday services are delightful to the educated and the faithful; but the unanimous voice of a body of hard-working East-end London clergymen assures us that "Neither in length nor in structure, nor in language is our liturgy adapted to the needs of the working-classes. It offers them that which they do not understand, and for which they do not care."

I say then that unless we are prepared to try other resources, to put into play new, more varied, and more energetic agencies, the influence of the Church among the working-classes, which is already at so low an ebb, will soon cease to exist altogether. We are living in a fool's Paradise if we flatter ourselves that the much-boasted revival of "Church principles" has made any impression on that vast multitude who are hardly to be called a class at all, but are rather the very backbone of the nation. A crowded church will be found in every large parish where the vicar is a good preacher and is beloved, quite irrespectively of whether he is High, or Low, or Broad. An impressive or gorgeous ritual, to say nothing of its expensiveness, will never of itself fill any church with workingmen, or produce any sort of effect upon them. The one thing which can and will reach them is *personal influence*; and to that they are always amenable, whether it come from a Frederick Robertson or a Father Lowder, from Maurice or Mackonochie, from Simeon or Dean Stanley. The poorer masses will never be reached by a particular set of views or practices; they will always be favourably influenced by earnest men.

Now it is this personal influence which cannot on any adequate scale be brought to bear by the parochial clergy in large and densely crowded parishes. It is not in one case out of a hundred that they get any real hold of the workingmen in a mass, though they may reach a few. The parochial clergy are rarely well off. They are married; they are incessantly occupied by meetings, addresses, classes, and organizations of all kinds. They get hold of the young in their schools, but they almost inevitably lose sight of the youths of both sexes immediately after their first communion. A large parish needs the exclusive work of one clergyman merely to keep touch with the young men; and to do this requires gifts and sympathies which perhaps no member of the clerical staff—even if he could be spared from other duties—may happen to possess. Yet the youths of both sexes constitute one of the most important classes of the community, and if they be lost sight of, it may well happen that they soon cease to be members of the Church in anything but name.

What, then, is the remedy?

There is no one formal remedy, but every remedy which can be brought to bear may be summed up in the *extension of the personal influence of high-minded, faithful, and educated men*.

Mankind has never been delivered by com-

mittees or organizations. Ultimately it has always been the individual who has flashed into other souls the electric impulse which has pervaded his own. The purification of corrupt societies, the conversion of barbarous races, the redemption of intolerable wrongs, has always begun with the action of a single heart, and the self-sacrifice of the one evokes the enthusiasm of the many. St. Antony, St. Benedict, St. Columba, St. Francis of Assisi, Savonarola, Luther, St. Francis Xavier, St. Vincent de Paul, John Howard, Wesley, William Carey, John Pounds, William Lloyd Garrison, Lord Shaftesbury—take away these names from the history of Christendom, and delete the influence they exercised, and modern Europe might still have been a chaos of barbarism and cruelty, of vice and superstition.

And what were the two great wings with which every one of them soared above the dead-level of their contemporaries, and uplifted with them their suffering and degraded fellow-men? They were the two great wings of enthusiasm and self-denial.

Enthusiasm and self-denial cannot be had to order, but in the hearts of good men there is a vast reserve-force of both, and they are called forth by special needs. When the hour has struck, the man is usually forthcoming. The hour *has* struck, and the Church anxiously awaits the man who shall have the requisite power to organize that which cannot fail to be a mighty movement.

Such a man, looking back at the annals of the past, will see that the great work of human amelioration, the conversion of the heathen, the recovery of the lapsed, the arousing of selfish and luxurious societies, can never be accomplished by proxy or by subscription lists, or by an office and paid secretaries, or by languid, advertising, and perfunctory associations. It can only be achieved by toil of heart and brain, by agonies and energies, by men who look neither for honour nor even for success, by men who work in faith and to whom the work is the reward. It was thus that gladiatorial shows were abolished, that slaves were emancipated, that prisons were purified, that drunkards were reclaimed, that factory children were rescued. And in almost every instance the work has been done by men who were not only singlehearted by nature, but who could devote themselves exclusively to their one main task by setting aside all personal ends, and keeping themselves disentangled from the cares of life.

When a great work has been begun, it be-

comes to
taken up
who ban
mated b
commu
head or
similar
of exclu
solve th
rows of
which i
to indiv

And
disgust
They w
has pro
you, in
tory, p
Church
it has l

I an
roduc
ticism
fright
fourth
begin
those
monks
and ot
oured
thoug
it upo
of the
monks
asticis
and t
for th
house
has b
emph

But
lishm
monk
and
and
neve
will
they
unde
may
mea
the
miso
equ
voca
ers
lic,
and
mer
get
serv

comes too large for a single worker. It is taken up by those who imitate his example, who band themselves into a community animated by the same high desire. But if the community is to carry out the work of their head or founder, they must be bound by similar conditions. And those conditions of exclusive devotion to one great end, resolve themselves mainly into three: the old vows of poverty, celibacy, and obedience, which in past ages added so vast a potency to individual self-sacrifice.

And at this point many will start back disgusted and terrified by the proposal. They will say Monasticism in age after age has proved itself a deadly failure. Would you, in defiance of the plain lessons of History, propose to re-introduce it into that Church of England by which the spirit of it has been deliberately rejected?

I answer that I should regard the re-introduction of all that is meant by "Monasticism" into the Church of England as a frightful calamity. Even as early as the fourth century the records of the Church begin to teem with shameful stories, like those about wicked, sensual and greedy monks which are recorded by St. Jerome and other Fathers. St. Augustine, enamoured as he was of the cenobitic life, and though he unwisely endeavoured to enforce it upon his clergy, yet confesses that if some of the best men he had ever known had been monks, so too had some of the worst. Monasticism may be possible to the saintly few, and they may secure its best conditions for themselves without leaving their own houses; but as an institution for many it has been stamped by History with fierce and emphatic disapprobation.

But the Brothers of the Poor whose establishment is in contemplation will not be monks in any sense of the word. The first and fundamental difference between them and monks will be this, that their vows will never be permitted to be permanent. They will be voluntary; they will be temporary; they will be dispensable; they will never be undertaken for more than five years; they may at any time be laid aside. By this means the Brotherhood will be saved from the intolerable curse of the monasteries, the misery and corruption of men who were unequal to their vows and had mistaken their vocation. Further, the life of the Brothers will be active, not contemplative; public, not secluded; enlivened by constant and cheerful intercourse with their fellow-men, not shut up in cells; busy with energetic beneficence, not swallowed up by seven services a day. It will be a life spent in the

very midst of the world, not entirely withdrawn from it. The one aim of the Brothers, lay and clerical, will be to serve, and to win, and to elevate, and to purify others; not to absorb themselves in the contemplation of how best to save their own souls. For the time that they are members of any Brotherhood they will live, gladly and unencumbered, as poor men among the poor. Their single rooms will be among the abodes of the poor, and will be always open to the poor. They will be the friends of the poor, not separated from them by abysses of external respectability, nor removed from the possibility of fully understanding the condition of their life. They will be face to face and shoulder to shoulder with the working-classes, earning their full confidence by manifesting unstinted sympathy with them in their needs and sorrows. They will not be crude, brawling, uneducated evangelists, with a stock of fluent and ignorant shibboleths, but gentlemen, men educated at our public schools and Universities, men of knowledge and refinement, who will be ready to make a cheerful sacrifice of the interests which most men hold so dear and in which they find so little satisfaction, for the sake of winning back the great masses of their fellow-countrymen in crowded cities to the inheritance of blessings which myriads are rapidly losing or have already lost. If they undertake this mission in the right spirit they cannot fail; and if they succeed, they will become the saviours of our modern civilization.

I believe that two or three thousand of such workers, costing the Church nothing, appealing for no funds, accepting no subscriptions, living (and that in perfect comfort) on £40 or £50 a year, derived either exclusively from their own private means, or given them by those who send them to their work, would produce an incalculable change in the future destinies of the Church of England, and therefore of England herself and of the world. They might diminish that horrible scourge of drunkenness, which is the worst curse of the working-classes, and which drags them down into abysses out of which they can never rise until they have emancipated themselves from the tyranny of the ginshop. They might deepen, and in many regions create afresh by their example, the lost ideal of purity, and save London from the disgrace and shipwreck of all that is best in human life, caused by the multitudes of fallen women who are now, alas! to be numbered by tens of thousands. They might grapple effectually with the subtle and spreading evil of

betting and gambling, and might help to dissipate the intolerable dullness and dreariness which now takes refuge in these spurious forms of excitement. Above all, the work and example of men whose lives were obviously devoted to the good of the poor at the spontaneous sacrifice of their own gain, could not fail to win the confidence of the great body of the people. Confidence, as the great statesman said, is a plant of slow growth. At present the clergy as a body do not possess the confidence of the people either in the country or in the cities. They have failed to convince them that the labours of the clergy should be *mainly* in the service of the poor because the poor are the more in number; and that they have a Gospel for the poor which neither Socialists nor men of science can offer them. It is more than doubtful whether this lost confidence can be won back by any of the present agencies. New efforts, new sacrifices are needed—new, yet in their method and spirit as old as Christianity itself—before the mass of the people can see those days of the Son of Man which they have lost, and for which in their inmost hearts they sigh. If any can suggest better or safer expedients to restore the religious life of the multitude than by the formation of Brotherhoods such as I have here indicated, let them not be contented to object and to criticize, but let them tell us what is needful.

"Si quid novisti rectius istis
Candidus imperti; si non his utere mecum."

The Southern House of Convocation has passed a unanimous resolution to the effect that the time has come when the Church can welcome the aid of such Brotherhoods; but it has not yet pledged itself to any details of their organization. This cannot be done till the next Session of Convocation in May 1890. But if the sanction of the Upper and Lower Houses be given to the formation of a body such as is contemplated in this paper, there can be little doubt that some one will come forward who will endeavour to lead the movement and to organize the work of Brethren of the Poor in parishes and dioceses where such work would be welcomed. Many of the Bishops have already expressed their approval of the plan, and if it be carried out under wise and favourable auspices, I am one of those who feel strongly convinced that it will bring to bear upon the religious needs of the multitude a force no less mighty than that which was exercised by the early followers of St. Benedict, or the Minorites of St. Francis, or the Poor Priests of Wycliffe, or the Piagnoni of

Savonarola, or the order of St. Vincent de Paul, or those whom John Wesley sent forth throughout the length and breadth of England to awaken the torpor of a selfish and slumbering Church.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM IN AMERICA.

BY J. E. C. BODLEY.

From *The Nineteenth Century*, London, November, 1889.

THE students of the Collegj Esteri at Rome are not in appearance an athletic race. They are a familiar feature of the Eternal City as they promenade somewhat listlessly its thoroughfares in groups of two and three, attired in the uniform of their various nationalities. The British tourist, as he suns himself on the Pincian Hill on a Sunday morning while his wife and daughters have gone to the English church at the Porta del Popolo, eyes askance what he calls their monkish garb, and as he unfolds his *Times* to read the correspondence on "Compulsory Athletics" he devoutly thanks heaven that his young barbarians at Harrow and Oxford are not as these students. Even to the more sympathetic observer these pale seminarists do not give the impression of being in training for the life of endurance which the main body of the Church Militant imposes on its officers wherever stationed, whether in the slums of Westminster or in the fever-stricken camps of Tonkin or in the swamps of the Zambesi river.

Such being the characteristic of these young ecclesiastics, the proceedings of a group of them surprised me not a little one sunny afternoon in the spring of 1887 on the flowery greensward of the Pamphilj Doria gardens. There, in an open space cleared among the ilex trees, a band of them, with cassocks turned up, were engaged in an active game. Its nimble mysteries were unfamiliar to English eyes, but the scientific manner in which a ball was thrown convinced me that the players were no foreigners. It is an ethnological fact that the Anglo-Saxon race alone is capable of propelling a missile in the method known as "shying." The young Disraeli, who had nothing of the Anglo-Saxon in his wonderful nature, gives expression to this, when writing to his father from Malta how some British officers playing rackets had struck a ball to where he was sitting, and how he picked it up and requested "a rifleman to forward its passage, as I really had never thrown a ball in my life." There was no

need, t
ian or
of the
what y
in the
land,
and we

This
Cathol
it was
tional
the Ch
from t
traditi
ing th
very sh

On
nearest
mark
travell
olic c
outpos
the Br
Cathol
edific
rows
dictio
celebr
at Be
name
and t
westw
reach
which
ed are
there
esting
tincti

The
half
land,
tion.
endu
they
Fren
right
son t
and
to F
ther
The
amis
John
Exe
inte
and
tion
whi
thei
harm
fath

need, therefore, to accost the players in Italian or in French, so, to my question to one of them, "Pray tell me who you are and what you are doing?" was made the answer in the unmistakable intonation of New England, "We are the American College, Sir, and we are playing at base-ball."

This was my first acquaintance with the Catholic Church of the United States, and it was a typical instance of the intensely national idiosyncrasy of that great branch of the Church Universal that its students sent from the New World to be imbued with the tradition of the Old should have been playing their American base-ball beneath the very shadow of St. Peter's.

On the shores of the western hemisphere nearest to Europe the first conspicuous landmark which from the Atlantic meets the traveller's eye are the lofty towers of a Catholic cathedral. Over Newfoundland, the outpost of the North American continent, the British flag flies, so that branch of the Catholic Church which set up the massive edifice crowning the heights above the Narrows of St. John's is not within the jurisdiction of the fathers, who are this month celebrating the centennial of their hierarchy at Baltimore, in the city which took its name from the first Governor of this colony, and thence, as we travel on the mainland westward for 3,000 miles till the Pacific is reached, the ecclesiastical provinces into which the vast Dominion of Canada is divided are in the same case. A passing glance, therefore, must suffice for these most interesting organisations with their marked distinctive features.

The Roman Catholic Church claims one half of the busy population of Newfoundland, and they to a man are of Irish extraction. The French rivals of these much-enduring fisher-folk are also Catholics, but they are only summer itinerants on the French shore which they occupy under treaty right, and at the close of the cod-fishing season they retire to their islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon or even recross the Atlantic to Brittany for the winter. Consequently there is not one French priest in the island. The clergy who work under that wise and amiable Irishman Bishop Power of St. John's and his colleagues have no sinecure. Excepting on the peninsula of Avalon, the interior of Newfoundland is uninhabited, and the clergy have to minister to a population scattered over a rock-bound coast along which fogs and icebergs are a daily peril of their parochial voyages. These serfs of a harsh truck-system, though Ireland is their fatherland, are totally unlike the Irish im-

migrants, who are one of the largest elements of the population throughout Greater Britain, such as are largely represented in Toronto and other dioceses of Upper Canada.

On the way to French Canada a little settlement is passed near the entrance to the Gulf of St. Lawrence which deserves a word of mention. The counties of Pictou and Antigonish on the north coast of Nova Scotia resemble the province of Quebec in the fact that a considerable proportion of their inhabitants can speak no English. French, however, is not their tongue but Gaelic, and among them are found a probably greater number of Gaelic-speaking Catholic Highlanders than in the whole of Scotland.

The fair province which skirts the waters of the St. Lawrence was called by Frontenac and the founders of Quebec "*La nouvelle France*," but Quebec has survived the old *régime* whose impress she bears, and now is the only bit of "*La vieille France*" that the world contains—"La vieille France in its most refined, Catholic, and devout age," as Cardinal Manning once wrote to me. There are quiet towns in France such as Laon and Soissons, which outwardly have an old-world look, but in the beautiful cathedrals of the old twin cities of l'Aisne the clergy and the Suisses are oftener the only men who assist at High Mass. At Quebec, the most nobly planted city of the western hemisphere, all is different. The Church is omnipresent. The view of the grey buildings seen from one's windows takes one back to the beginning of the last century, and the sight of a daily newspaper scarcely removes the illusion, for the little French journal under its "*Faits divers*" announces a miracle which took place last week in a neighbouring village, and in an official column advertises the sentence of excommunication read on Sunday by the curé of St. Joseph at Lévis upon a luckless couple who have been defying Divine law and human conventionality.

Even the pastimes of the faithful are fashioned according to the *ancien régime*. or, at all events, certain modern forms of amusement are strictly banned. The Governor-General is in residence at his summer quarters, and the maidens of Quebec implore for a dispensation for a ball at the Citadel. All in vain: they are sternly referred to the official manual on *Les danses et les bals*, a grim little tract which commences with the severe proposition that "*La danse et les bals, comme ils se font ordinairement, sont un scandale et un danger*," and under the heading of "*Les danses immodestes*" they may read "*sont réputées telles les danses*

modernes connues sous les noms de Valse, Polka, Galop, Cancan et autres semblables." It must not from this be imagined that the last named of these "dances vives" is a usual feature of the programmes of viceregal or other polite festivities in Canada, and why the good curé of N.D. de Quebec should have bracketed it with the other less volatile measures is a mystery. Perhaps the Highland reel was danced in Lord Lorne's time, and was mistaken for it; but this is only conjecture. At all events the maidens of Quebec refuse to be consoled with the historical fact that Madame de Maintenon never danced the polka.

The Church in Lower Canada not only regulates the lives and occupations of the people, but it directs the politics of the province. That it represents no mere faction is shown by the attitude of the Federal Parliament at Ottawa whenever the Provincial Assembly legislates on the Church's behalf. The Jesuits' Estates Bill gives 400,000 dollars out of the treasury to the Church in compensation for the property of the society which escheated to the government subsequent to the suppression of the Order by Clement XIV. The powerful Orange lodges of Ontario have set the country ablaze with an agitation this year, which has swept out of sight commercial union, the fisheries, and every other Canadian question, urging the Dominion Parliament to recommend the veto of the bill. But Sir John Macdonald, our Canadian Premier, himself an Orangeman, is the astutest statesman on the American continent, and he knows that in French Canada the Church and the people are one and indivisible. Hence in the Parliament at Ottawa, with its Protestant majority in a house of over 200 members, only thirteen could be found to vote for the disallowance of the bill.

Amid the bitter strife of creeds the Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec maintains the respect and confidence of the Protestant minority of the province (which includes most of the wealthy and educated of the border city of Montreal), so much so that it has been seriously suggested in Protestant quarters that for the protection of the minority it would be advantageous if representative institutions in Quebec were abolished, and the government of the province invested in Cardinal Taschereau. The Jesuits have great influence in Lower Canada, and they are not universally beloved among their co-religionists, but the hold which both the person and the office of the Archbishop of Quebec has upon the affection and imagination of the populace is daily made mani-

fest. The scene on the day of the installation of the Cardinal after his return from Rome, whither he had been summoned to receive the scarlet hat, was most memorable, when, amid the roar of artillery and the clang of bells, he gave from the balcony of the Basilica the benediction to the kneeling multitude.

Cardinal Taschereau is not a man of the people, as are some of his most capable suffragans and colleagues. Monseigneur Duhamel, the able and refined Archbishop of Ottawa, is a fine example of the best type of *habitant*, a Canadian in everything, even to the pronunciation of his native language. The Cardinal, on the other hand, is a courtly French prelate of the last century. A visit at the old palace is a ceremony of some solemnity. The Vicar-General Père Legaré with graceful urbanity welcomes the visitor in a sumptuous chamber hung with the portraits of the occupants of the see of Quebec for more than two hundred years, beginning with Laval and St. Vallier, till the Cardinal enters, in his robes of scarlet and violet. For an hour the dignified old man discourses in the stately French of the last century, which seems alive again. At one moment his talk is of the decadence of the times, the perniciousness of modern literature, but it sounds as if a prelate of old France were deprecating the growing license of the more recent works of the author of the *Henriade* or lamenting that Crébillon's dramas were supplanting the masterpieces of Racine. The only inharmonious note is the modern costume of the Cardinal's visitor: for the rest the scene is such as is sometimes portrayed on the walls of the Salon—it is *Une audience chez son Éminence sous Louis Quinze*.

I have lingered too long in the fascinating region of Quebec, but Cardinal Taschereau will be referred to again in connection with Cardinal Gibbons, so it is as well to give some slight impression of the head of the mother Church of America and of his surroundings.

The Church in Ontario has been mentioned, so, hastening westward, we will not pause until the great lakes are passed and Winnipeg is reached. A few years hence Manitoba may be as populous as Illinois, but at present the work of the Church is chiefly missionary in its character. Archbishop Taché's suffragans are Frenchmen, not French Canadians, and there is a vast dissimilarity between the domestic *habitants* of Quebec and the half-breed Métis of the North-West, who are by degrees giving way to immigrant settlers from every nation of

Europe, the Food erable among The pr nesses of Canadia passes had be men, v winds t Fraser, may be cross v ground the mis

The Atlanti display acterist the wor and th the jo justify ability varyin Canad present as man one at Chure ritual, little b a log- French bec or in To Lower and m the C Catala Flemi journe from cross state tion, eroger the D in lan of lif Texan or the a citi ances tonic be Pa Meth Cath stamp acter

Europe. Still further westward we go to the Foothills of the Rockies, where the venerable Père Lacombe is ending his days among the Indians who call him father. The prairies are left behind and the fastnesses of the mountains are entered. The Canadian Pacific cars thunder through the passes twice a day, but ten years ago they had been trodden by the feet of no white men, with one exception. As the train winds through the magnificent valley of the Fraser, here and there on mountain tops may be seen, black against the sky, a rude cross which marks an Indian burying-ground, consecrated in these solitudes by the missionaries of Rome.

The passage over English territory from Atlantic to Pacific is highly interesting as displaying the varied capabilities and characteristics of the two greatest organisations the world has ever seen—the British Empire and the Church of Rome. At each stage of the journey the Church Universal is seen justifying its title of Catholicity by its adaptability to the nature and the needs of each varying community. The Dominion of Canada, federated under the British flag, presents within its limits differences almost as marked as those which distinguish from one another the States of Europe. The Church of Rome observes precisely the same ritual, framed in identical language, for a little band of Blackfeet Indians kneeling in a log-hut in the far west, as it uses for a French congregation in the Basilica at Quebec or for the Irish immigrants who worship in Toronto Cathedral; but the Church in Lower Canada differs in mode of thought and manners of its members as widely from the Church in Ontario as do the Catholic Catalonians of Barcelona from the Catholic Flemings of Antwerp. Within a few hours' journey from Vancouver in the west and from Montreal in the east a frontier is crossed beyond which an entirely different state of things is found. The American nation, though sprung from sources more heterogeneous than those of the inhabitants of the Dominion, are completely homogeneous in language, in sentiment, and in economy of life. The New York millionaire, the Texan ranche-man, the farmer of Vermont, or the planter of Louisiana is above all things a citizen of the United States whether his ancestors were British or Batavian, Teutonic or Scandinavian, whether his religion be Papist or Presbyterian, Episcopalian or Methodist, and the members of the Roman Catholic Church throughout the Union are stamped with unmistakable national characteristics as were the base-ball-playing

seminarists in the Pamphilj Doria gardens.

Almost fifty years have passed since Macaulay wrote: "There is not and there never was on earth a work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church." In the interval, the Holy See has lost its sovereignty over a strip of Italian territory: the troops of the Empire which was the bastard offspring of the French Revolution no longer garrison the Castle of St. Angelo, but the Church, if it has lost the temporal sway of a province, has gained spiritual dominion all over the face of the earth, and that by the indirect agency of the chief Protestant race of the world.

That the Anglo-Saxon is the most vigorous race which the world has ever seen is shown by the ease with which it is imposing the English language on all peoples with which it intermingles—not by conquest, as in the case of some of the Roman colonies, not by penal coercion, as in that of the French Huguenots at the Cape, whose language was stamped out by the Boers, but simply by contact. The American nation affords the great exemplification of this process. In the British Empire it is being carried out, though less conspicuously; but in the United States, where probably less than one half of the inhabitants are of purely British descent, it is so complete that the grandchildren of Germans who spoke no word of English will talk to an Englishman of the Elizabethan literature as "our common inheritance." It may be urged that the Irish Catholics have done as much as the Anglo-Saxons in making English the *lingua franca* of half the world's surface. This is in a sense true, but the Irish are not, strictly speaking, a colonising race. The Irish, like the Germans, are splendid settlers, and Greater Britain would have been a comparatively small domain without their prolific aid; but since the days when Spain and Portugal made South America a Catholic continent, the Anglo-Saxon race alone has founded colonies successfully. The Catholic countries of Europe have ceased to colonise, but the Church of Rome has not suffered thereby. Such is her marvellous vitality and energy that in these last fifty years she has made progress in English-speaking countries, which perhaps in the end will be of greater moment than all her previous achievements, establishing herself in the newest colonies founded by Protestant England, and extending her sway within that part of the North American continent which two centuries earlier was colonised by Protestant Englishmen.

Mr. Gladstone has been taken to task, it is difficult to see why, for his recent prediction in Paris, that a century hence the American nation will be "the great organ of the powerful British tongue." We are all hopeful for the future of the British Empire, but the future of the British Empire is fraught with anxious uncertainty, whereas the pathway of the American Republic is unobstructed and clear, and it seems to be humanly certain that in less than a hundred years' time it will be the most populous civilised nation of the world, and the greatest in material prosperity. Its difficulties ahead, which are remarked by its men of foresight and by outside critics, are not such as are likely to interfere with either of those consummations. Mr. Gladstone's estimate of the population of the United States a century hence was 600,000,000. Although we are familiar with similar prodigious figures in reference to the teeming hordes of the Chinese Empire, it is almost impossible to grasp the idea of myriads in connection with Western civilisation, still less of such numbers being gathered together in one nation, speaking our own English language. If the greatness of nations is to be gauged merely by population and commercial prosperity, there can be no doubt that America is fated to take the foremost place among nations, but it will only be set up in that high place when the peoples of the Old World, with their literature and historic traditions, shall have abdicated their position by consenting to the doctrine that numbers and material wealth alone constitute the greatness of a State.

In the relations of the Roman Catholic Church to the American nation we have, then, one of the most interesting phenomena it is possible to conceive—the contact of the most venerable and powerful organisation of the old order with the most advanced and prosperous community of the new. In all the varied history of the Church of Rome she has never had the experience which in the United States she has encountered during the hundred years since the establishment of the American hierarchy. In the Old World the old civilisation has grown up side by side with her, and there is no page of the history of Europe which is not marked with the Fisher's seal. Nor has her activity been confined to the civilised places of the earth. On virgin soil she has worked with self-denying enterprise in every quarter of the globe, and the early history of the remoter parts of the great American continent is the record of the Jesuit fathers and the other missionary pioneers of Rome. But in

the United States the Church finds itself in the midst of a new civilisation, of the highest type as regards the diffusion of education and material comfort through all classes, though imperfect by reason of the nation never having passed through the discipline of youth to its precocious manhood, since in America there has been no slow development from barbarism through mediævalism to a ripe civilisation. The Church which in the Old World has assisted at the birth and death of empires and principalities—crowning kings, upsetting dynasties, and hastening revolutions—here in the New World, amid a transplanted society, knows nothing of treaties and frontiers, nothing of wars of succession and State intrigue. It is in America that she seems to have the greatest opportunity of realising the admonition of her Founder, "Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo."

Americans of culture frequently lament that theirs is not a land of lofty ideals. Perhaps no nation—as a nation—has a high ideal; but in England and France and Germany (though this is no golden age of literature) we have teachers who take us out of the traffic of the market-place. In America, unfortunately, literature seems almost to have come to an end. The brilliant band of New Englanders, most of whom came out from Harvard College, has nearly disappeared, and few successors are forthcoming. The blight which has fallen on American authorship seems like a nemesis for the iniquitous copyright laws, which are a remarkable expression of the lack of moral sense of the nation. The Church of Rome has a new experience in exerting her influence among this too shrewd, too practical, too prosperous people, the most characteristic offspring of the nineteenth century. Men may disapprove the methods of the Catholic Church and discredit her beliefs, but few will deny that her ideal is the most perfect ever set before the human race.

The American nation, again, is lacking in tradition. The soil of the United States—or, at all events, a portion of it—has an independent history of a hundred years, but the mass of the people only inherit it by adoption. American art seems to have exhausted itself in pictorial representations of Generals Burgoyne and Lord Cornwallis in humiliating situations; but few of the ancestors either of the painters of historical pictures or of the patriots who deliver Fourth of July orations bled in the Revolutionary War on the side of the colonists. When the capitulations at Saratoga and Yorktown took place, they were passing their boyhood as

compa
how
wound
Spring
their
growing
allies

The
the Cl
Ameri
ple is
ment
hopefu
man C
one w
dom.
have i
torica
man C
lish-sp
tively
recent
actual
Amer
Engli
positi
who f
sion o
towar
Unite
bring
gener
Rome
memb
living

As
great
of a n
upon
haps
soriou
serva
sensit
and s
the d
our c
about
there
which
imita
lish r
the
the u
count
ions.
the c
Amer
own
durat
their
of h

compatriots of Robert Emmet, and hearing how Lord Edward Fitzgerald had been wounded by the American rebels at Eutaw Springs, or were watching the last days of their monarch, Frederick the Great, and growing up to be the foes of the French allies of young America.

These are some of the attributes which the Church of Rome has to bestow upon the American nation. In return, that great people is investing the Church with an endowment of greater magnitude than the most hopeful enthusiast for the spread of the Roman Catholic religion ever dreamed of, and one which is likely to revolutionise Christendom. Of all the languages of Europe which have influenced civilisation, English, for historical causes, has been spoken by fewer Roman Catholics than any other tongue. English-speaking Catholics have been a comparatively small body, the majority of whom, as recently as half a century ago, were persons actually born in Ireland. The growth of the American nation, as the largest organ of the English language, is completely changing the position of our tongue among the millions who follow the faith of Rome. The expansion of England in her colonies is assisting towards this remarkable issue, but the United States is the chief instrument in bringing about the result, which men of this generation will live to see, of the Church of Rome having a greater number of its active members speaking English than any other living language.

As it is impossible to treat of one of the great influences which regulate the conduct of a nation without expressing some opinion upon the people, I should like, though perhaps needlessly, to disclaim any spirit of censoriousness in my necessarily imperfect observations. Americans are said to be hypersensitive with regard to English criticism, and small wonder if they are so, considering the *de haut en bas* tone assumed by many of our countrymen when speaking or writing about American institutions. It is true that there is a small section of American society which, by its singular admiration for, and imitation of, what is least laudable in English manners and customs, lays itself out as the object of British patronising airs, but the unworthier forms of Anglomania do not count for much in a population of sixty millions. There are no people on the face of the earth who are more willing than are Americans to discuss with outsiders their own foibles and to listen with generous endurance to strictures upon them, provided their critics approach the subject as amateurs of human nature, and not with that air of

superiority which may be the secret of England's greatness, but which also is the secret of our being the best-hated nation in the world.

My impression is that Americans are much less tolerant of criticism from their countrymen than from strangers. Bishop Potter's great sermon on the hundredth anniversary of Washington's inauguration, which came like a warning peal of thunder amid the crackle of the centennial fireworks, was received as a thunderstorm would be by a holiday crowd assembled for a pyrotechnic exhibition. Mr. Henry James, it is said, would, if recognised at Schenectady, receive at the hands of the survivors of the family of Mr. Ezra B. Miller a reception similar to that experienced at Tarascon by a luckless *commis voyageur*, who registered his name at the "Empereurs" as A. Daudet, and was chivied to the station and almost into the Rhone by the outraged comrades of the immortal Tartarin. Mr. Matthew Arnold—"We still had Thyrsis then"—gave less offence by his own comments on things American than he caused by quoting from Emerson, at the conclusion of his lecture at Boston on the philosopher of Concord, the presumably well-known sentence, "great, intelligent, sensual, avaricious America;" but it was whispered that the culture of Massachusetts, which is said to be in the habit of murmuring snatches of Emerson in its sleep, actually did not recognise the passage as an excerpt from their master.

In the early spring of 1887, when the students of the American College were playing their national game in sight of the Vatican, grave events were taking place within its walls, in the interest of the Catholic Church in the United States. Cardinal Gibbons was in Rome. In the June of the previous year he had been created cardinal, and his presence, for the purpose of being invested with his title and the red berretta, was causing the liveliest curiosity among the American tourists wintering in the Holy City. There was a lady from Chicago (Chicago people declared that she came from St. Louis) whose gratification at having seen the new Cardinal knew no bounds. "He is one of the most intelligent of our citizens," she remarked, "and is the author of the best book about Rome, any way, and I'm going right away to the store in the Piazza di Spagna, to see if they have gotten a Tauchnitz copy of his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*."

To stimulate the taste for bibliography of his western compatriots was not, however, even the ulterior object of Cardinal Gib-

bon's visit to Rome. On the 7th of June, 1886, two scarlet hats were assigned to North America, the head of the Canadian hierarchy being called to the Sacred College on the same day as the Primate of the United States. Some months later an event unprecedented in the history of Christendom took place when two princes of the Church crossed the Atlantic Ocean in one vessel. The voyage together of the two cardinals on the French packet from New York to Havre was a most dramatic situation, inasmuch as one of them was about to make his official visit to Rome the occasion for moving the Congregation of the Holy Office to rescind a decree which it had pronounced at the instance of the other. Two archiepiscopal travelling companions surely never found themselves in such a remarkable position: regarding one another with sentiments of affectionate respect, equal in their loyalty to the Church, and of equal authority in her councils, summoned to Rome to receive the highest reward in her gift (save the triple tiara), these powerful chiefs of neighbouring hierarchies were about to approach the Holy Office with petitions of irreconcilable tenor. The Archbishop of Quebec's mission was an easier one than that of the Archbishop of Baltimore. Cardinal Taschereau had only to advise the Supreme Congregation to follow out tradition by adhering to a delivered judgment. Cardinal Gibbons had undertaken the prodigious task of moving the Holy See to go back upon its own decision.

A month before the two Archbishops were created Cardinals, there was read in all the churches of Lower Canada the following "mandement," issued by Monseigneur Taschereau:—

Having learned that the delegates of a society known as the Knights of Labour have tried to recruit members in parts of this province, we deem it our duty, brethren, to put you on your guard against it, and mark, we do not speak in our own name, but in that of the Holy See, whose advice we have sought. In October 1885 we sent to Rome an authentic copy of the rules and constitutions of that society. The Congregation of the Holy Office, having examined them with all due precaution, sent us this answer, which should be for you an absolute rule of conduct, and keep you away from the Society of the Knights of Labour:—"On account of the principles, organisation, and statutes of the Knights of Labour, that association is to be relegated among those which are prohibited by the Holy See."

Archbishop Gibbons at once grasped the importance of this proceeding. He summoned to Baltimore a Commission of the Archbishops of the United States, which decided by ten voices to two that neither justice nor prudence demanded the condemna-

tion of the Knights of Labour, and sixty out of the remaining sixty-three bishops expressed the same opinion. The two Archbishops who voted for condemnation are prelates of exemplary piety, but neither of them can be considered to be in touch with the modern movement. One of them, the venerable Archbishop of St. Louis, was consecrated to that see half a century ago, when the Missouri was the boundary of the far west, remote from civilisation. The other, the Spanish Archbishop of Santa Fé, has for his diocese the wild territory of New Mexico, which supports only thirty-six secular priests, nearly all of whom are Spaniards or Mexicans.

In February 1887, after Cardinal Gibbons's arrival in Rome he presented to Cardinal Simeoni, the Prefect of the Propaganda, a memorandum which is one of the most statesmanlike documents ever penned by an American, and which takes a much wider scope of the questions involved than the mere consideration of the legality of any given organisation. A few quotations translated from this lengthy memorial must suffice. The Cardinal, with thoroughly American sentiment, remarks that an organisation the head of which has been called into conference by the President of the United States cannot be deemed hostile to authority. He then declares that the power of monopolies in America has made organised opposition necessary, and that "it is not only the right of workmen to protect themselves, but it is the obligation of the entire people to assist them in finding a remedy for the dangers with which civilisation and social order are menaced by avarice, oppression, and corruption." Association, he says, is "in harmony with the genius of our country," and he discards as "neither possible nor necessary in our country" the idea of fraternities under the supervision of priests taking the place of purely industrial organisations wherein Catholics and Protestants meet on a common footing, which intermingling constitutes no danger to religion: "the only grave danger would arise from the alienation of her children from the Church, which nothing would occasion more certainly than imprudent condemnation." After some remarks on the ethics of strikes and the uselessness of hoping that violence can always be avoided in them, the Cardinal proceeds:—

It is the part of Christian prudence to convert into a legitimate, peaceful, and beneficial competition that which a course of repellent severity would turn into a latent volcano such as society fears and the Church deplors in Europe. On this point I

strongly
with the
convinc
tion wh
ing cla
Church
gospel
fundam
society
the way
ing con
portant
ing and
present
general
social d
things
main in
As Car
era the
and Pa
the glo
none v
Friend
nation
Cathol
of mill
miratio
belief.
will no
but soc
the cor
portan
fairly

The
recapit
will in
of con
the le
'unar
nation
the en
her."
a pater
nical
will la
The
only t
would
tem a
ple re
cial fr
frank
pruden
Churc
Amer
she n
of."
Cardi
take
a sen
repres
hiera
more
argum
an op

strongly insist because my intimate acquaintance with the social condition of our country profoundly convinces me that we are face to face with a question which not only concerns the rights of the working classes, who ought to be specially dear to the Church sent by our Divine Master to preach the gospel to the poor, but one which involves the most fundamental interests of the Church and of human society in the future. Everyone who ponders well the ways along which Divine Providence is guiding contemporary history must recognise the important part which the power of the people is playing and will play. . . . Hitherto our country has presented the picture of true democracy seeking the general prosperity by means of sound principles and social order. To preserve this admirable state of things it is absolutely necessary for religion to remain in possession of the affections of the multitude. As Cardinal Manning has well said, "In the future era the Church will have to deal not with Princes and Parliaments but with the masses." . . . Of all the glorious titles earned by the Church there is none which gives it greater influence than that of Friend of the People. Surely in our democratic nation this is the title which is winning for the Catholic Church not only the enthusiastic devotion of millions of her children, but the respect and admiration of all our citizens whatever their religious belief. . . . As the great questions of the future will not be those of war, of commerce, or of finance, but social questions which relate to the bettering of the condition of the masses, it is of sovereign importance for the Church to be found invariably and firmly ranged on the side of humanity.

The memorial concludes with an eloquent recapitulation of the dangers the Church will incur if she adheres to "the easy course" of condemning this labour organisation, not the least being "the accusation of being 'unamerican,' that is to say, foreign to our national sentiment—the most powerful arm the enemies of the Church can direct against her." The Holy See will be regarded not as a paternal power but as an unjust and tyrannical authority, while the social agitation will last as long as there are ills to remedy. The forms of organisation are necessarily only temporary. To strike at one of them would be to embark upon a war without system and without end. The American people regard with calm the progress of the social struggle, and "to speak out with the frankness imposed on me by my office, both prudence suggests and the dignity of the Church demands that we should not offer to America an ecclesiastical protection which she neither asks for nor thinks she has need of." As is well known, the result was that Cardinal Gibbons induced the Holy See to take the unprecedented course of revoking a sentence which had been recorded on the representation of the Primate of another hierarchy, a re-decision which appears the more remarkable the more the Cardinal's arguments are weighed, revealing as they do an opportunism of a type more advanced and

enlightened than the Church has had the credit of sympathising with.

Near the old manor-house where once lived Charles Carroll, the latest survivor of the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the kinsman of John Carroll, the first Catholic bishop in the United States, among the verdant woods and pastures of Maryland stands a college directed by a staff of Sulpician fathers. During one of my visits to Baltimore, one of these good French priests, a Rémois by birth, delighted to see a traveller who was familiar with the vine-clad hills of the Marne, confided to me the contrast he had experienced between the solemn ceremony attending an audience at the Archbishop's Palace at Reims and the kindly welcome the humblest priest was certain of receiving from the great American Cardinal at his "Residence." The old-fashioned unpretentious house, where a good deal of the world's history is being moulded, would be scorned by one of those sleek preachers of the gospel of sleekness who fatly flourish in certain American cities. For all that, Charles Street, Baltimore, has a dignity which Fifth Avenue will never attain to. Beacon Street, overlooking Boston Common, is in the springtime more beautiful, but there is an air of distinction not found in any other thoroughfare in the United States in the street which takes its name from the royal husband of Henrietta Maria, in whose honour Maryland was named. Baltimore itself was called after an English title which became extinct years before two-thirds of our present peerage existed, and its old world associations are not inappropriate for the head-quarters in the new world of the Church which is here initiating a work undreamed of by Cecil Calvert, or the daughter of Marie de' Medici, if the future of their faith ever exercised the minds of those seventeenth century Catholics.

A walk with the Cardinal through the tranquil streets of the residential quarter of Baltimore gives a vivid impression of the affection with which the Monumental City regards its distinguished son who was baptised and ordained in the Cathedral over which he now presides. Though Maryland is a Roman Catholic stronghold there is a vast Protestant population in its great commercial capital, yet, as the Cardinal passes along, nearly every hat is doffed to the simple citizen who has made a greater impression on European policy than any American of his generation. One day last spring we found ourselves in the midst of a congregation streaming out of a church, the architec-

ture of which the Cardinal drew my attention to, while he responded to the salutations of the crowd. I naturally concluded that they were his own people, but no, he explained, "they are our Episcopalian friends." The determined prelate who was strong enough to lead the Vatican to reverse its own decision has nothing of narrow arrogance in his gentle nature, which loves to live in charity with all men. In his popular exposition of Catholic doctrine, "Faith of our Fathers," of which nearly two hundred thousand copies have been sold in thirteen years, though it is a controversial work, the Protestant sects are nowhere offensively referred to as heretics or schismatics, but as "my dissenting brethren."

The delicate youthfulness of the Cardinal's countenance makes it difficult to realise that he was a Bishop twenty-one years ago. A year later, when he was only thirty-five, he attended the Ecumenical Council and was one of the minority which voted against the promulgation of the Definition of Infallibility. I have heard him quote the impressive peroration of Cardinal Simor, the Primate of Hungary, in his speech opposing its adoption, "*Hannibalis exercitus ad portas Romæ stat; equorum strepitum audio*," prophetic words which were uttered a few months before the troops not of a foreign invader but of Victor Emmanuel were at the Porta Pia.

On the question of Church and State the Cardinal holds the view practically universal among Americans of all creeds, that the Church should be absolutely free from State control, and entirely dependent on voluntary support. He relates how, during the Second Empire, he once, on his way from Rome, visited the Bishop of Annecy in Savoy. "I was struck with the splendour of his palace, and saw a sentinel at the door, placed there by the French Government as a guard of honour. But the venerable Bishop soon disabused me of my favourable impressions. He told me he was in a state of gilded slavery; 'I cannot,' said he, 'build a sacristy without the permission of the government.' I never wish to see the day when the Church will invoke or receive government aid to build our churches or to pay our clergy: in proportion as State patronage would increase, the sympathy and aid of the faithful would diminish."

The biographer of Father Damien, with all his sympathy for the Church of Rome, gives, as one reason for his dissent from her communion, that she discourages the reading of the Bible by the laity, an impression shared by most Englishmen who passed their

childhood twenty years ago or more. Mr. Clifford ought to have heard with me a sermon preached last March, of the tenor of which the following extract from the *Baltimore Sun* will give some idea:—

Cardinal Gibbons preached at the Cathedral yesterday morning the first of the sermons he is going to deliver on Sundays in Lent. His subject was "Reading the Bible," to which he strongly urged his hearers to give some minutes at least every day. After instancing St. Augustine's and other conspicuous conversions, which resulted from hearing passages in the Word of God spoken, he proceeded: "St. Charles Borromeo says, 'The Bible ought to be the garden of the priest.' I say it ought to be the garden of the laity, too. What is good for us is good for you. God forbid we should go to heaven alone. We should be lonely there without you, shepherds without their flocks. We ought not to have a monopoly of religion, holiness, and goodness," &c. &c.

There was one expression in this sermon which struck me, as the Cardinal made use of it more than once, the words "spiritual profession" in contexts where "priestly office" was the almost obvious phrase and would certainly have been chosen by a Ritualistic curate, as in the sentence, "In season and out of season I am by the apostle bidden to exhort you by virtue of my spiritual profession." His life and teaching are a protest against sacerdotal pretension. On the morning of my last interview with the Cardinal, he had just returned from an Ordination, and he said to me, "I have been warning my young priests not to think that the putting on of a cassock means the putting off of one's humanity," just as in "Faith of our Fathers" he had written, "Should a priest consider himself greater than other men because he exercises such authority? Far from it; he ought to humble himself beneath others when he reflects to what weak hands are assigned such tremendous powers."

As the Cardinal has declared to the laity in the name of the priesthood that "It is our earnest wish that every word of the Gospel may be imprinted on your memory and on your heart," it would be a magnificent memorial of the Centenary of the American Hierarchy if the assembled Bishops would move the Holy See to permit them to super-vise an American edition of the Bible to supersede the Douay translation. The English Authorised Version has become such an integral portion of English literature that the most powerful Church is handicapped among English-speaking people in not using its phraseology. There are a score or two of passages which would need emendation for doctrinal reasons, but the rest of the *Anglica versio* the Roman Catholic Church

might appropriate with great advantage to herself without the surrender of a shred of doctrine. There are hundreds of verses of Holy Scripture and hundreds of Biblical names, which in our authorised form have passed into the everyday language and literature of the people—perhaps to a greater extent in America even than in England: most of the classical passages have precisely identical meanings in their equivalents in the Douay Bible, but in that version they are as uncouth and unfamiliar as are proper names like Achab, Assuerus, Aman, and Mardochai. The Catholic Church in America has adopted one detestable institution from the Protestant churches in England—the pew system, which is as inappropriate in a democratic country as it is inconsistent with the principle of the great Church of the people. Why not restore that Protestant institution to the sole use and enjoyment of American Protestants (for the English Church is discarding it), and take in exchange the noblest translation ever made in the days before translation was a lost art, which is in truth the common heritage of all English-speaking people?

An able writer, quoting Bishop Vaughan of Salford, has recently remarked upon the debt which the Church of Rome owes to the Irish, in whose brogue her services are recited all over the world. Undoubtedly the immigrant Irish have done a great propagandist work, but no graver mistake could be made than that of supposing that the Catholic Church in America is merely a branch of the Church in Ireland. Much misapprehension as to things American is caused by travellers forming their judgments from what they see in New York, which is emphatically not a microcosm of the United States for the reason that in no other city does the immigrant population remain unassimilated so long. Visitors sometimes leave New York with the idea that the Catholic Church in America is represented by Tammany Hall, on account of the prominence of that institution; but if they went down town to the neighbourhood of the Church of St. Antony of Padua, they might equally well imagine that the Church in America is exclusively Italian, and in another quarter they would find German priests serving German congregations. The unceasing flow of immigration makes New York the least American city of the United States; but throughout the Union the grandchildren of men born in Westmeath or in Westphalia are as thoroughly American as are the descendants of the ladies who “refused George Washington,” who, from the number of

their progeny, must have been more numerous than St. Ursula’s virgins at Cologne. Of course, the Irish accent is heard at many a Catholic altar between Boston and Santa Barbara. The first church I entered in the United States was the Cathedral at San Francisco, where the preacher was a fair-haired young priest, with the face of an angel and a brogue which carried one from the Golden Gate to the Cove of Cork; but the vicar-general of the diocese, who is a member of the old Irish family of Prendergast, is as polished an American gentleman as is Archbishop Corrigan of New York, or Archbishop Ryan of Philadelphia, both of whom bear Irish names, and neither of whom has any more brogue than has President Harrison, who is descended from the Puritan regicide.

Nor must it be imagined that the Catholics of America are in great preponderance Irish, even by descent. Opening at random the clergy list of the United States, I find at the commencement of the letter B the following names: Baak, Baart, Baasen, Babiniski, Bachand, Bachmann, Backes, Badelon, Badilla, Baeumle, Baker—half the nationalities of Europe represented; Dutch, Flemish, Spanish, German, French, Polish, Hungarian, and English, but no Irish name. Of course, if the book had opened at letter O, we might have lighted on a very Irish column, interspersed with a few exceptions, like Oechtering, Oeinck, Offergeld, and Ogulin. The list is instructive as showing the cosmopolitan character both of the American nation and of the Catholic Church. The enumeration of the occupants of the see of New Orleans exemplifies this. French bishops might be looked for in the Creole episcopates of Louisiana, but the present Archbishop of New Orleans is a Dutchman, and his predecessors this century have included Spaniards and a Belgian, as well as Frenchmen.

It should be noted, however, that the nationality of a priest in the United States does not necessarily afford information as to the origin of his congregation, whether he be Irish, German, or of some less numerous race of settlers. The proportion of foreign priests to the Catholic laity is large, on account of the obvious difficulty in obtaining sufficient candidates for a profession which does not offer great pecuniary rewards in a country where material prosperity is the chief aim of life. Two hundred young seminarists singing Tenebræ in the choir of Baltimore Cathedral for this reason struck me as a most interesting spectacle to witness in America. The son of a peasant or of a

humble tradesman in Connaught or in Flanders, by taking holy orders, secures high social promotion, and his modest clerical stipend is usually a large advance on the income he would have touched had he followed his father's calling. In the United States there is no peasantry, and the young postulants for the priesthood recruited from all ranks of life are each giving up the chance of acquiring wealth, which is the birthright of every United States citizen. All honour is due to that small section of the manhood of America, whether found among theological students or among professors and teachers at Harvard, Yale, and Johns Hopkins, which voluntarily abnegates a career held in the highest honour, because opulence is its goal, and dedicates itself to a life of relative poverty, for the sake of religion or of sound learning.

Philadelphia, unlike New York, is a typical American commercial city which illustrates the position and progress of the Roman Catholic Church in the Union. Although the estimable Society of Friends is not as relatively strong there as formerly, and though Pennsylvania was in the old days a favourable locality for Catholic settlers, yet the tradition of Philadelphia is decidedly Protestant. For all that, the "Quaker City" contains nearly as many Roman Catholics as the entire population of Rome. It contains more Catholics than the entire population of any other town in Catholic Italy but Naples; of any town in Catholic Spain but Madrid; of any town in Catholic Belgium but Brussels; and of any town in France except Paris and Lyons. Among the great Catholic cities of Europe whose inhabitants are less numerous than the Catholic population of Philadelphia are Milan, Turin, Palermo, Barcelona, Antwerp, Bordeaux, and Marseilles. Statements in this form are frequently made to illustrate the vastness of London, but Philadelphia is not even a London on a small scale. It is a characteristic American city of the first rank, larger than any single British municipality in the provinces, but not much larger than Manchester and Salford together with the adjoining townships, and it contains over 300,000 Catholics. The next census will probably show that this figure is considerably below the mark, as the diocese contains 400,000 Catholics, and there is no great centre of population within it outside Philadelphia.

When we find that the Roman Catholic Church can claim 10,000,000 United States citizens in a population of 60,000,000, it is difficult to over-estimate the influence which

the expansion of the Church in America will have on the future of Christendom. Judging from her past progress and considering that the two races to which the majority of American Catholics belong are the two most prolific of the white races in the United States, it seems certain that she will increase her proportion with the growth of the population. But, calculating as if she will remain relatively stationary and reducing by one-third the estimated 600,000,000 which it is predicted that the United States will contain in a hundred years' time, the Roman Catholic Church will then claim nearly 70,000,000 English-speaking people in America alone. By that time Australasia, South Africa, and Canada will be thickly inhabited. Under what flag those vast regions of the earth will be governed, no one can foretell, but two things are certain—that the English language will be spoken throughout them, and that the Church of Rome will maintain the progress she has commenced this century among English-speaking peoples. If every French-speaking person in the world is counted as a devout Catholic, the number of French-speaking Catholics will long before that period be immeasurably below that of the English-speaking Catholics; and the same may be said regarding the Italian and Spanish languages.

Without waiting to realise the forecast that the English tongue is fated to be the chief language of the Roman Catholic Church, we may consider some of the effects already produced by the establishment of that religion among the English-speaking people of America. Not the least achievement of that great branch of the Church which is now celebrating the centenary of its hierarchy is that it has saved the Roman Catholic religion from the reproach often heard in Europe that its growth is only found associated with social retrogression and reaction. In France this feeling has relegated religion to the cult of women, children, and peasants, and in Ireland alone of European countries is the Church in sympathy with democratic progress.

Some Liberal critics may object that though Cardinal Gibbons may be thoroughly imbued with the democratic spirit it is not in harmony with the unchanging policy of Rome, which is hostile to liberty; that the Church may profess the most Liberal doctrine while she is in a minority, but that if she obtained ascendancy we might witness an *auto da fé* in Madison Square. Cardinal Gibbons approaches the subject of religious persecution from the other extreme, and is so inspired with the charity which thinketh

no evil
ligions
ma of
In "Fa
my hea
of pers
tion m
referen
he says
express
slaught
that th
another
measur
of Rom
these t
creed o

It is
studen
nal's v
Churc
power
secuti
ligious
the Pu
from t
at the
the sp
and it
Quake
New
lighte
of En
ish co
sion,
quent
politi
St. B
defen
litica
stand
is pro
we li

Th
the p
show
dead
ed o
relig
duct
of t
For
will
ly si
cisel
mor
in t
his
less
fort
tag

no evil that he protects the Protestant religions as well as the Catholic from the stigma of having countenanced persecution. In "Faith of our Fathers" he writes, "From my heart I abhor and denounce every species of persecution of which the Spanish Inquisition may have been guilty;" and again in reference to the Massacre of St. Bartholomew he says, "I have no words strong enough to express my detestation of that inhuman slaughter;" but in both instances he denies that the Church was responsible, just as in another passage referring to the proscriptive measures of Protestants against the Church of Rome he says, "I know full well that these acts of cruelty form no part of the creed of the Protestant Churches."

It is to be feared that more sceptical students of history cannot accept the Cardinal's view, and that the truth is that every Church has persecuted when it has had the power and the opportunity, so long as persecution was part of the economy of the religious and political life of the day. Even the Puritans who came to America to escape from the Anglicans who had in turn suffered at the hands of the Catholics did not leave the spirit of persecution behind in Europe, and it is well known how they put to death Quakers and burnt witches alive in their New England settlements. The most enlightened Prince who ever sat on the throne of England, who moreover secured the British constitution and the Protestant succession, consented to the torture and subsequent massacre of Cornelius de Witt for a political offence, just a hundred years after St. Bartholomew. It is absolutely futile to defend or to condemn the religious and political methods of the past by the milder standard of to-day. "*Homo homini lupus*" is probably as true now as it ever was, but we live in an age of anaesthetics.

The policy of the Church in Spain during the present century may perhaps be cited to show that the spirit of intolerance is not yet dead; but in answer to this it may be pointed out that in modern times churches and religious sects are often in matters of conduct strongly influenced by the atmosphere of the country in which they are placed. For example, a Scotch Presbyterian minister will denounce Sunday amusements as a deadly sin, while a Dutch predicant, holding precisely the same theological tenets, will after morning service spend his Sunday afternoon in the Bosh at the Hague listening to what his Scottish co-religionist would call godless music. Cardinal Gibbons again, in his forthcoming work "Our Christian Heritage," in a chapter on "The Religious Ele-

ment in our American Civilisation," points with pride to the national observance of the Christian Sabbath, which his distinguished colleague in the Sacred College, Cardinal San Felice of Naples, would regard as merely local usage. The most remarkable instance, however, of public opinion moulding the policy of Christian churches used to be found in the United States, when throughout the eleven Slave States of the Union ministers of religion in their own pulpits and assembled in synods, presbyteries, and conferences, used to declare "that, as the Great Head of the Church has recognised the relation of master and slave, we conscientiously believe that slavery is not a sin against God." Slavery was abolished; public sentiment accepted the inevitable; and the clergy of the Southern States ceased to take their texts from the Epistle to Philemon.

Cardinal Gibbons's opportunism is not of this description. His denunciation of monopolies in his memorial to the Holy See is as courageous an act in the America of to-day as the denunciation of slavery would have been in the Southern States thirty years ago. The illustrations of the influence exercised by public opinion on religious policy were only given to show that though Spain under a certain *régime* might foster intolerance in the Church, a country like America could find no room for a religion of reactionary tendency, and the fact that the Catholic Church has taken root in that land and is flourishing is the best proof that in the United States she is abreast with the democratic movement and with liberal progress.

If France is the eldest daughter of the Church, America is destined to be her strongest and biggest child, and it will be interesting to watch this youngest daughter maintaining the position she has already secured in the intimate councils of the Church. If the elder branches were well advised they would look to America to provide the Church Universal with a ruler. All the best friends of the Papacy, outside the "Italian ring" which fences it round, are agreed that the time has come when it would be for the highest interest of the Church to break down the tradition of the last three centuries and a half which prescribes that the occupant of St. Peter's chair shall invariably be an Italian. We have seen how the Church has gained a stronger title than ever to its claim of universality, but the constitution of the Sacred College is Italian and not cosmopolitan. The full complement of that august body consists of seventy cardinals. The

present number, since the recent death of Cardinal Schiaffino, is sixty-five. Ten of them are Austrian, German, Hungarian, and Polish; seven are French; five are British subjects (of whom one is French Canadian); four are Spanish; two Portuguese; one Belgian, and one American: thirty representing all the nationalities of the world, and thirty-five being Italians.

With this Italian preponderance, the other nationalities would have less ground of complaint if at the Vatican there were a corresponding council of state, in which the non-Italian Catholics were represented even in the inadequate proportion of thirty to thirty-five, but the intimate advisers of the Sovereign Pontiff are all Italians, who, with one or two exceptions, can neither read nor speak a word of English. For charm of manner, a polished Italian prelate is unrivalled, but his knowledge of the English-speaking world is that of a little child. The most accomplished Italian priest, even if he has been occasionally employed on a mission to a Catholic court, has no comprehension of constitutional government, still less is he capable of understanding the democratic movement of the age. The Vatican has a certain aptitude in dealing with "sovereigns and statesmen," to use Lord Beaconsfield's expression, but we have seen how Cardinal Gibbons reminded the Sacred Congregation, on the great authority of Cardinal Manning, that in the coming era the Church will have to treat, not with princes and parliaments, but with the masses of the people.

Although there is no immediate prospect of a vacancy in the Holy See, predictions are constantly being made as to the successor to Leo the Thirteenth. These journalistic prophecies are of no value whatever, excepting from the significant unanimity with which they make the coming Pontiff an Italian. Sometimes the Conservative Vicar-General of the Pope, Cardinal Parocchi, is designated. Sometimes it is the Liberal Archbishop of Naples or the Liberal Patriarch of Venice. Cardinal San Felice is famous for his courageous devotion to the sufferers during the cholera at Naples, when he accompanied King Humbert through the hospitals:—but I remember witnessing a more courageous act on the part of Cardinal Agostini at Venice, when he officiated at the christening by Queen Margherita of an ironclad with the significant name of "Galileo," in the official presence of Signor Crispi, who, on his recent appointment to the ministry of Signor Depretis, had been denounced by the clerical journals as an excommunicate. The election of either the Neapolitan

or the Venetian Cardinal would doubtless ensure a *modus vivendi* between the Vatican and the Italian Government, but the Church needs a ruler whose wisdom and enlightenment is capable of dealing with farther-reaching questions than those which relate to the limits of the kingdom of Italy.

It would have been a happy choice for the Church, and one the importance of which it is impossible to exaggerate, if the Sacred College had in its wisdom selected as successor to Pius the Ninth the great Cardinal who is at the head of every religious and social movement in this country; but what the Church Universal would have gained, England would have lost. Cardinal Manning occupies a unique place in English history; there is no other instance of an individual exercising similar power and influence in this country, who has not been aided by legislative or official rank. It is probable that the Cardinal is content with his unprecedented position, yet it is strange in these days when much is talked about strengthening the Upper House by giving it a representative character, that no Prime Minister has ever seen fit to advise the offer of a place in it to the eminent Englishman who represents not only all the Catholic population of these islands, but the entire struggling populace of our cities, of every creed, and without a creed. A peerage would confer no dignity or even precedence on Cardinal Manning, as by the Queen's sign manual, he was, on the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, with the assent of the Heir to the Throne, and the present Prime Minister, who were members of it, assigned precedence immediately after the Royal Family. It is a long drop from the chair of St. Peter to a seat in the House of Lords, and there is a certain bathos in associating a modern coronet with the venerable head which might have worn most worthily the triple tiara.

Although Cardinal Manning would have been the most powerful pontiff since Hildebrand, every one who has the slightest knowledge of feeling on the continent is aware that an English Pope would be placed in a situation of peculiar difficulty on account of his nationality. Italy might object to a French Pope; Portugal might be jealous of a Spanish Pope; but the appointment of an Englishman to the Holy See would excite the animosity and the intrigue of every government on the continent.

The United States stand in a very different relation to the powers of Europe. All the continental nations have a friendly feeling for Americans—a sentiment which

Amer
clear
which
might
the f
for A
Amer
for G
to h
reaso
eleva
Cath
ed to
matt
Euro
fill
thor
vers
diti
Am
deta
life
man
it s
too
Bri
view
clar
in
ma
unc
Th
the
her
nes
the
can
of
Ar
the
ber
as
ho
re
ar
th
th
va
th
yo
an
co
ci
in
ro
ti
d
n
P
r
i

Americans will retain as long as they steer clear of international complications into which Samoan and Cuban entanglements might draw them. It is to be feared that the friendliness of the continental powers for America is stimulated by the idea that America as a nation has not too much love for Great Britain. Monsignor Keane is said to have recently given at Nashville some reasons why an American should not be elevated to the Papacy. The Rector of the Catholic University at Washington is reported to have stated that "an American, no matter how learned and how well posted in European affairs, is thoroughly unfitted to fill the Papal See. The Pope must be a thorough cosmopolitan. He must be conversant with the political and spiritual conditions of France, Germany, and Spain. No American can grasp the situation in all its details. His educational surroundings and life are totally different from that of the man who is fitted to fill the Papacy." Now, it seems to me that the learned Bishop is too modest on behalf of his countrymen. A British traveller who has taken a superficial view of America might come back and declare that the only cosmopolitans to be found in the United States are the American maidens, whose knowledge of the world is undoubtedly as profound as it is amazing. The American politician is rarely a man of the world, but America takes no pride in her politicians; the American man of business frequently looks upon Wall Street as the centre of the universe; and the American man of fashion is a maladroit travesty of an Englishman. But the manhood of America does not wholly consist of such as these. The shrewd American nature is the best foundation for knowledge of the world as soon as it is removed from the narrow horizon of American life to which the Bishop refers. What more thorough cosmopolitans are to be found in any capital of Europe than certain diplomatic representatives of the United States? They have had no advantage of training; they are taken from the lawyer's desk or the professor's chair, yet they are able to hold their own with, and win the admiration of, the most accomplished products of our old European civilisation. It is the success of these men in adapting themselves to unfamiliar surroundings, and in forming confidential relations with statesmen and potentates often denied to *diplomates de la carrière*, which makes one believe that, from the worldly point of view, the highest position in Europe could be worthily filled by an American.

Of the ecclesiastical qualifications of Cardinal Gibbons for the most exalted honour in the Church's gift, it is not for a layman to speak. It is enough that the Holy See has seen fit to set him at the head of one of the most powerful and perhaps the most intelligent hierarchy in the world, and that the Vatican has paid unprecedented respect to his counsel. Of his fitness as a man of affairs and of his knowledge of the world I have had some opportunity of forming a judgment. During many months of travel and residence in the United States and Canada my observation led me to the conclusion that the North American continent has produced in this generation two really great men, in the sense that the last generation accounted Lincoln and Cavour as great. One of them we have the honour of reckoning as a fellow-subject of the Queen, Sir John Macdonald, the Prime Minister of our Canadian Dominion. The other, the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore, although twenty years his junior, is his equal in marvellous knowledge of men, and, although in some respects of singularly different nature, resembles him in the possession of that lofty opportunism which is the essential of true statesmanship. Cardinal Gibbons combines the suavity of an Italian monsignore with that ingenuous integrity and robustness which we like to think is the characteristic of our Anglo-Saxon race. If he were called to occupy the most conspicuous and most ancient throne in Christendom he would not go to Europe as a novice in European affairs. To have assisted at an Ecumenical Council at an age when most men are on the threshold of a career is an early training in cosmopolitanism rarely experienced. During the intervening twenty years the Cardinal's frequent visits to Europe have brought him into contact with some of the acutest intellects of the Old World. Moreover, since his elevation twelve years ago to the head of the hierarchy of the United States he has governed an episcopate and a priesthood which are composed of members of every European nation. His unexampled undertaking two years ago, when, the youngest member of the Sacred College, he prevailed upon the Holy See to reconsider a momentous judgment, was not the achievement of a man whose attributes are merely local and national. The installation in the chair of St. Peter of this enlightened English-speaking Churchman would be an event of such import to human society that one dares not hope to see its accomplishment, for it seems as if it would be the first step towards bringing back to the Church the great democra-

cies which are destined to govern the world, and as if it would hasten the time when "unum ovile fiet et unus pastor."

THE RESULTS OF THE EPISCOPAL CONVENTION.

From *The Christian Union*, New York, Oct. 31, 1889.

THE attention which the triennial Synod of the Episcopal Church has received from the secular press during the last three weeks is out of all proportion to the amount of legislation which has been accomplished or the formal laws which have been enacted. Much was expected of the Convention by members of this Church, but a large proportion of the matters on which it was hoped that some action would be taken have been passed over until another session. The change of name, the reaching of a new basis of representation, the erection of a Court of Appeal, the passing of a canon on marriage and divorce, the appointment of suffragan bishops, the settlement of the hymnal question, the provincial system—all these issues have been deferred; and the feeling is very strong, apparently, among the Episcopal people, that action on these matters ought not to have been postponed. On the other hand, the Convention has clung with great tenacity and substantial success to the revision of the Prayer-Book, which it has completed, so far as its work could be final, with the expectation that a standard book can be reached in the Convention of 1892. The work of this session has been substantially confined to the revision of the Prayer-Book, and the spirit of the changes has been to reach greater simplicity and flexibility rather than to conform more closely to English usage and precedent. It was very evident that the clerical and lay deputies did not care to favor advanced doctrine, though they did not seem to wish to deny a rightful amount of liberty in that direction. What was very noticeable in the process of revision was that Ritualists and Broad Churchmen frequently voted for the same propositions. So far as a rough estimate can be made of the results reached by the present changes, the effect will be twofold; it will compel a stricter and more catholic observance in some directions, and will allow a greater flexibility or latitude in others. It is believed that no important doctrines have been touched, and the wonder is that, in voting on the revision step by step in the popular house, the result has been generally wise and conservative, and without special party bias. No one school of

thought has had its way, but the result is such as to improve the Prayer-Book without injuring it. All religious bodies have an interest in these changes, because in the general advance toward liturgical worship the Episcopal Church takes the lead. The Convention will be known as the one that carried liturgical revision through to practical results; but this was not the only work of legislation. The canon on deaconesses is a wise recognition of the services of Christian women; the appointments for missionary bishops were wise and judicious; and the dioceses admitted into union with the Convention, and the new missionary jurisdiction set off from Nebraska and called the Platte, indicate the advance in religious work. But all this does not present a large result for three weeks of deliberative work.

If the Episcopal Convention is to be rightly interpreted, it must be judged, not by the amount of its legislation, but in the same light in which the recent Congregational Council is regarded. It is in some sense a clearing-house. During its recess questions arise which need discussion, and often demand legislation. A Church Congress may discuss them, but it acts upon an ecclesiastical body only so far as it shapes public opinion; the Convention discussed questions with a view to legislation, and in the presentation of different sides of it in free debate it is often the case that no further discussion is required. It is for this reason that much of the action in the Episcopal Convention was disappointing to those who watch it from the outside. It seemed again and again to be reaching an important result, when, through the non-concurrence of one house with the other, a check was interposed and no result was possible. It is for this reason that many things which Churchmen evidently hoped might receive treatment in the Convention were laid on the table or passed by. Then it has been apparent that legislation was often avoided because it might conflict with the provincial system, which the Convention dodged, but which thoughtful men in the Episcopal Church regard as inevitable, if not near at hand. The entire session in New York had this attitude of delay with reference to every important question brought before it except the revision of the Prayer-Book. It was evidently the desire to give the largest possible consideration to important changes before finally acting upon them. There was the further impression that the Episcopal Church is at this time in a transitional position. It is passing out of a restrained and cramped life into one of large freedom and multiform

activit
the de
debate
up.
men,
best.
exten
servat
sire t
menta
ious l
that
' bun
given
confi
more
lines
was n
ped
spiri
Depu
the v
Epis
its t
for g
Chr
mun
we v
spec
is th
put
be a
fore
ing
emp
has
ical

o'c
of
ph
un
to
M
B
th
cu
in
A
p
w
E
r

activity. This was evident in the order of the debates as well as in the attitude of the debaters. The party lines were all broken up. Men spoke and voted, not as party men, but on their conviction of what was best. This was never known to the same extent before, and it indicates that the conservatism of this Church is yielding to a desire to place it in the heart of the movements which to-day control American religious life. We have noted with satisfaction that Churchmen are increasingly free from "bumptiousness," that they are less and less given to boasting about Episcopacy, less confident of their isolated mission, more and more desirous of working in the common lines of religious thought and life. This was not said in so many words, but it cropped out a hundred times as the animating spirit of the Bishops and of the House of Deputies. To us this was the best result of the whole Convention. It showed that the Episcopal Church is less careful to maintain its traditions than to establish a reputation for good and effective work among American Christians. The strong points of this Communion are evident to everybody, but what we wish to see in it, and what has been the special distinction of its recent Convention, is that its strength has been applied to the putting of its house in order so that it can be a better working Church than ever before. This, in a word, has been the prevailing note of the New York session, and in emphasizing this note the Episcopal Church has increased its friends among all evangelical Christians.

THE AMERICAN BOARD.

REPORTED BY "MANHATTAN."

From *Zion's Herald* (Methodist), Boston, Oct. 23, 1889.

ON Wednesday afternoon, Oct. 16, at 3 o'clock, Dr. Storrs, the honored president of the "A. B. C. F. M.," stood upon the platform in the Broadway Tabernacle, and in the presence of a vast congregation called to order the American Board of Foreign Missions. It is nearly sixty years since the Board met in this city, and as questions of the gravest import were to come up for discussion, great interest was aroused not only in New York, but in "the regions beyond." And so the great church was filled in every part and from first to last the proceedings were followed with the deepest attention. Broadway Tabernacle is too well known to require description. Standing on the corner

of 34th street and Broadway, in the centre of business life and energy, surrounded by stores of all descriptions, with the trains of the Elevated Railroad rushing by every few minutes, horse-cars passing up and down in never-ending streams, wagons, trucks, and carriages of all descriptions adding to the general tumult, one would imagine that in a place like this the spirits of gain and greed and avarice would make impossible calm and holy worship. But William M. Taylor is pastor of this church! And under his inspiring leadership this church is thronged morning and evening every Sabbath throughout the year. When a man has anything to say, people usually want to hear it; and Dr. Taylor has a good deal to say, and what he says is worth hearing.

As a proof of this, read, if you get a chance, his address of welcome to the Board. It was a hearty handshake in words. It was words made flesh. It was phrased in English, accented in Scotch, and American in grip and earnestness. Of course Dr. Storrs made a graceful and eloquent reply. Anything else would be impossible with Dr. Storrs. He is always graceful and always eloquent. And what a president he makes! Keen, quick, shrewd, with a commanding presence, and a voice wondrously distinct, he kept the meeting under the most perfect control.

After this delightful exchange of courtesies, the Board listened to reports from the prudential committee, presented by Secretary Alden and Treasurer Ward. The total receipts for the year were something over \$680,000, and the expenditures not far from the same amount.

At the evening session there was an immense congregation. The church was thronged to the doors, and to hear that multitude sing was worth a journey across the city. We used to think that Methodist congregations had a monopoly in the way of singing, but any one who attends a meeting of the American Board, will have that illusion dispelled. And possibly other illusions as well. But the singing at these meetings has been hearty, vigorous, tuneful, and in volume almost equals that of Spurgeon's congregation in London.

Dr. L. Pratt, of Norwich, Conn., was the preacher for the evening. And he did preach. "As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you," was the text, and the obligation resting upon the Christian Church was presented with a force, a vividness, an intensity, which all who heard could not but realize. "The missionary spirit is not a phase of Christianity, it is Christianity," is

a sample sentence of this most suggestive and appropriate discourse.

On Wednesday morning, Dr. Alden presented a very valuable paper on "The Place Occupied in Missionary Work by Prayer," after which there were devotional services of half an hour led by Dr. A. H. Plumb, of Boston. The American Board may be divided on questions both of doctrine and polity, and it may discuss these questions with much heat and vigor, but its discussions never break in upon its devotions, and all through there is a most intense religious feeling. Diligence in business and fervency of spirit unite most happily in these gatherings, and to break up the routine of "Whereas," and "Resolved," and "Mr. President," with thirty minutes of song and prayer and testimony, is "as rivers of water in a dry place."

At this session Secretary Smith read a most remarkable paper on "Africa." A more comprehensive, statesmanlike document it would hardly be possible to imagine. The needs, conditions and claims of the Dark Continent were sketched in a masterly way.

Secretary Clark, through illness, was not able to be present, and so Dr. F. E. Clark read the secretary's paper on "Japan." This paper was very interesting, and when we remember that Japan has only been opened to missionary effort for seventeen years, and that now our Congregational friends have there forty-three self-supporting churches out of a total of forty-nine, with eight thousand converts as seals of their ministry, we can readily see how God has favored them in the land of the Mikado.

At the afternoon session a special committee was to report, and as the air was somewhat electrical, a storm was feared. Dr. Behrends, of Brooklyn, presented this report, which was to the effect that a large number of circulars had been sent out to pastors, corporate members of the Board, and professors in theological seminaries, asking what change, if any, was desired in the method of electing corporate members. The replies had not been as numerous or as definite as the committee had reason to expect, and hence they were not prepared to suggest any substantial change. It looked for a few moments as though the report of the committee would be accepted without any discussion, and the matter be disposed of for the present; but Dr. Patton, of Washington, in a very mild, gentle way, made a "few remarks," and the great question of the hour was made prominent. The subject of representation, of tests, of men who have been accepted by the churches and yet

rejected by the Prudential Committee, was now before the meeting; and to get rid of it without angry debate, seemed almost impossible. Dr. Griffin, of Boston, was the next speaker. He declared in the plainest terms that many of the Congregational ministers of Boston and vicinity would not be accepted as missionaries by the Prudential Committee, owing to doctrinal differences, and that the Prudential Committee was very like a secret tribunal before which the would-be missionary must appear. Dr. Griffin spoke with much force and earnestness, and evidently was heard favorably by a large proportion of the audience, if we may judge by the applause which his words called forth. But as the audience on the main floor and galleries had no business to interfere any more than spectators in a court-room, the president very properly rebuked any attempt at applause. After Mr. Ely, of New York, a corporate member, had spoken, pleading for some change in the system, Dr. R. R. Meredith, of Brooklyn, made a most earnest and vigorous speech. *En passant*, what a magnificent speaker Mr. Meredith is! His voice is wonderfully rich, not only in strength, but in tone, and he possesses that strange quality which for lack of a better word we call magnetism. But the "Liberals" had it all their own way, for from the "Conservatives" "not a drum was heard, not a funeral note." Still the committee was continued, which was the objective point of the debate.

At this stage a communication was read from the managers of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Chaplain McCabe, Dr. Baldwin, and Gen. Fisk were introduced by the chairman and made brief addresses. These addresses were apt, bright, and telling. All three speakers were at their best, and you know what that means.

In the evening the crowd was so great to hear addresses by returned missionaries and others, that an overflow meeting was held in the Presbyterian church on W. 34th Street, and this service, as well as the one in the Tabernacle, was of special interest.

On Thursday morning the report of the committee on "Africa" was presented by Dr. G. S. Walker, of Hartford, Conn., after which two most valuable and interesting addresses were given by Rev. E. H. Richards and Rev. J. Tyler, both missionaries in Africa. The committee on programme are to be congratulated on their arrangements in this particular. They not only present most admirable reports from each special field, but they introduce missionaries from

that field, and thus diffuse the most profitable information, and also create the greatest possible interest. Our Congregational friends do not run much to "speechifying," or enthusiasm as some regard it, but they believe in giving the fullest light concerning the work that is being done, and in this way receive intelligent contributions from a willing people. And this is much the better way. In many instances enthusiasm is but another name for gas. Red-hot speeches are very often red-hot nonsense. Money raised by mere excitement is seldom a free-will offering. The first thing that God did for this world was to make light, and the more light people have, the more money they will give.

Prof. Fisk, of Chicago, read the report of the committee appointed to consider the work of the Prudential Committee, and then another debate of a very interesting and suggestive character took place. Possibly all of the readers of *Zion's Herald* are not aware that the Prudential Committee is appointed by the corporate members of the Board, and as these corporate members are not elected by the churches, nor in any wise amenable to the Congregational Council, but are a self-perpetuating body, the entire power of the American Board is vested in them. So far this body has been eminently conservative, and looks with disfavor upon the "new theology" idea of which we have heard so much within the last few years. As the Prudential Committee virtually control everything, the corporate members have been careful to see that the majority represented, both in doctrine and polity, the most conservative elements. And so a man who might be accounted worthy to preach the Gospel in Boston, would not be allowed to preach it in Bombay. The savages of New York and Chicago might have for a minister one who had misgivings concerning certain disputed points, but the same man must not go to Zululand or Tokio. The heterodox brother could remain at home, assume the pastorate of a great church, raise all the money possible for the American Board, and thus send the orthodox brother abroad to do work among the distant heathen. It would be going too far to say that this was a case of "a house divided against itself," but truth compels the remark that the "big brothers" of this house differed very widely on some important matters.

After one or two others had spoken on the report presented by Prof. Fisk, Dr. McKenzie, of Cambridge, made a strong speech. It was not loud, or passionate, or bitter, but it was calm, judicious, and effective.

Such a speech at such a critical time was of the greatest moment, and to the final result Dr. McKenzie made a great contribution.

Rev. H. W. Warren, of Cincinnati, was the first member of the committee to make any definite reply to the many speeches already delivered, and his reply was earnest and manly. His reference to the "City of New York" standing within a few miles of port after a splendid voyage across the Atlantic was most apt and telling. Several others spoke, but the report was not recommended by a vote of 23 to 54.

The report of the committee on "Japan" was read by Prof. Fisher, which was followed by able speeches by Prof. Tucker, of Andover, and Dr. Griffis, of Boston. After the noon recess the Lord's Supper was celebrated, and the occasion was one of deep spiritual feeling. Then came a report on "Turkey," read by Joseph Cook, of Boston. Mr. Cook is evidently of the orthodox wing, if his report and address may be taken in proof.

After the election of a score or more of corporate members, two reports were presented by the nominating committee, the one dropping Rev. C. A. Dickinson from the Prudential Committee, the other dropping Dr. Alden from the office of home secretary. These reports brought things to a head. The rumors and unrest of the past days at once took form, and for a little while serious trouble was feared. When two or three had spoken in opposition to the majority report, Lyman Abbott, of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, made an earnest plea for harmony, to which Dr. Noble replied, and the discussion at this point was a little warm and slightly personal. Dr. Behrends, Dr. Meredith, Dr. Taylor, Washington Gladden and others took part in the discussion, but thanks to the strength and manliness of Dr. Storrs, a happy and peaceful solution of the problem was secured. Both men were retained: Mr. Dickinson was kept on the committee, and Dr. Alden was appointed home secretary. A committee of nine was appointed to inquire into the methods of administration at Boston, and to recommend any changes that may seem needful, and after some routine business this most exciting and eventful session closed.

At the evening session Dr. Storrs, the re-elected president, delivered a most brilliant and powerful oration. Though possibly just a little weary after the excitement of the afternoon, yet in the presence of that vast audience he forgot all about fatigue, and surpassed even himself. Few men in

this country, or any other, could have given such an address. It was profound, scholarly, comprehensive, and yet it was attractive, interesting, powerful. He spoke of the purpose of this meeting, the great object which controlled the American Board, and of the inevitable success which lay before them. He dropped a sentence which may be as potent as Robert Hall's "liquid fire and distilled damnation," when he hoped that the money which liquor-dealers received from the sales of their foul drinks in heathen lands, "might be as hot in their hands as the asphalt which covered the depths of hell." At this session Gen. Howard offered prayer, and to hear that immense audience unite with him in repeating the Lord's Prayer was most thrilling.

On Friday morning the Board met for its final session. This, perhaps, was one of the most interesting and valuable of any of the meetings held. Addresses were made by some returning missionaries and also by some young men just under appointment. There was something not only heroic, but pathetic, in the spectacle of several bright, highly-cultured young men, standing in the presence of that vast audience, and for the last time for many years looking upon the faces of Christian friends, and then going to distant lands to toil for the Master whom they love. The age of chivalry is not gone. Leonidas and Peter the Hermit have their successors. The martyr spirit of Nero's time and of the Middle Ages is still in the church. It is comparatively easy to die for Christ, but to live for Him in the midst of degradation and heathendom is a much greater test of love and sacrifice. These young men made no boast or parade of their devotion. One of them thrilled the audience with the statement that on the morning when he received word that the Board had accepted him and he was under appointment to Africa, "he was more happy than a bridegroom on the morning of his marriage day." Men like this are not "of such stuff as dreams are made of." No dream ever made an African missionary. Nothing but God's love as a fulcrum, and Christ's cross as a lever, could raise men to this sublime height of loyalty and devotion.

Bishop Hurst was present at this service, and made a brief but thoughtful and appreciative address. Prayer was offered for the missions and the missionaries, after which votes of thanks were passed, and the Board adjourned to meet in Minneapolis one year from date. Then a most fervent and touching prayer was offered by Dr. Taylor, and Dr. Storrs pronounced the benedic-

tion, and this eventful but highly profitable and successful meeting was dismissed.

THE STRUGGLE IN THE AMERICAN BOARD.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, Oct. 23, 1889.

THE New York meeting of the American Board will be regarded as one of the most notable in its history and in the annals of the Congregationalist body which it represents. The division of opinion concerning future probation with which the troubles of the last half-dozen years began widened into something more permanent than a theological controversy. It came to be a question of denominational policy; it was whether the American Board, which has always been managed as a close corporation, should take into its service as missionaries men who represented the broader type of thought and belief which is growing in favor among all Protestant denominations; and the organization of this body was such that it could be controlled in the interest of the conservative opinions. At Portland, at Boston, at Des Moines, at Springfield, and at Cleveland, a majority of votes could be had in favor of the traditional policy of the board and of a form of theology that was in vogue when the organization was begun in 1810. Meanwhile, what has been called "the new departure" had been spreading from parish to parish, and the reason of the one-sided policy of the Prudential Committee of the Board had been discussed in every Congregational parish in the country, and a large proportion of the wealthier laity had become unwilling to contribute liberally to missions. The extent of this defection was manifest in the steady decline of contributions, and it was supported by the unwillingness of men in the New England seminaries to enter the foreign field.

This was the situation when the American Board met in this city to hold its eightieth session. Dr. Storrs had accepted the presidency two years ago in the service of peace, but had not been able to secure it because the disposition among the managers of the board had been not to recognize the liberal men in its direction, and as the conservatives were to the liberals as two to one, this did not seem to be necessary. The meeting just concluded began entirely under the control of its historical representatives, and up to the last hours of the next to the last day of its session there was no yielding on any

point t
empty
alienat
to carr
Preside
vative
change
the sw
All alo
curren
nestne
pleadin
peace,
for a
nothin
differ
the ene
grew a
whole
on wh
seemec
Storrs
for par
est dif
ing or
on wh
comm
scene
brothe
flush
spirit
stood
them
It was
invisi
been c
ishes
The
strugg
over,
the ex
a reas
allow
togeth
just a
peace
moral
give c
torati
and i
quest
more
with
mina
tiona
reach
freely
simp
out t
been
tofor

point to the wishes of the liberal men. An empty treasury and young men of ability alienated from the missionary field seemed to carry no weight with them, and evidently President Storrs felt with the other conservative men that the situation could not be changed. But the race is not always with the swift nor the battle with the strong. All along there had been a pathetic undercurrent that represented the piety and earnestness of the denomination, and the pleading of the men in the pastorate for peace, for toleration of divergent opinions, for a unity in essentials that compromised nothing vital, and for talking out needless differences till they were composed, and as the end of the session drew near the pleading grew so earnest and so irresistible that the whole board was lifted up to a higher plane, on which for the moment all their differences seemed to disappear. It was then that Dr. Storrs rose to the occasion and spoke not for party but for the comprehension of honest differences of opinion within one working organization and for a broader platform on which all could stand in the service of a common cause. Those who witnessed that scene in the Broadway Tabernacle when brother looked brother in the face and the flush of anger passed into the joy of the spirit of love, and when Dr. Storrs visibly stood amid the divided host and commanded them to act as brethren, will never forget it. It was as if conditions were changed by an invisible hand, and the American Board had been delivered into the custody of the parishes as their representative.

The meaning of the culmination of this struggle is that, though the conflict is not over, steps have already been taken by which the existing differences will be adjusted and a reasonable divergence of opinion will be allowed on both sides while brethren work together in unity. The committee of nine just and reasonable men representing true peace-makers now appointed will have the moral support of that memorable meeting to give character to their action and the restoration of harmony in the American Board and in the congregational parishes is only a question of time. Churchmen have breathed more freely since our memorable contrast with the same end in view reached a culmination in 1874, and to-day the Congregationalist body is to be congratulated on reaching the point when it can move more freely toward the constructive unity in a simpler religious belief and in the marking out to better working methods than it has been possible for it to move as a whole heretofore.

REVISION OF THE CONFESSION OF FAITH.

From *The Christian Standard* (Disciple), Cincinnati, Oct. 12, 1889.

THE discussion of the revision of the Presbyterian standards is becoming quite pronounced and stirring, and the signs are that the heat of the battle is not yet reached. We propose now and again to notice what is being said by leading Presbyterians on the different sides of the issue, for it is many-sided. Some desire no change whatever; some advocate a few slight changes in what is judged to be unfortunate phraseology, but are opposed to any change in the substance of the doctrine; while still others would be pleased to see its Calvinism supplanted by semi-Arminianism. The chief point of attack has been the chapter that deals with the doctrine of "God's Eternal Decrees." In opposition to all clamors for change Prof. W. G. T. Shedd, D.D., LL.D., in the *New York Evangelist*, stands for the Confession as it was at the beginning. He claims that a creed that was adopted by Charles Hodge and Albert Barnes is sufficiently broad to include all who are really Calvinistic and Presbyterian in belief. He seems to forget, for the moment, that Albert Barnes contradicted the doctrine of the Confession on certain vital issues in one of his books, and found it necessary, in order to retain his standing, to consent to the expunging of what he had written, and what he continued to believe until his death. Prof. Shedd is right when he says:

The doctrine of the divine decrees is the particular one selected by the Presbytery whose request has brought the subject of revision before the General Assembly. But the doctrine runs entirely through the Westminster documents, so that if changes were made merely in Chapter III. of the Confession, this chapter would be wholly out of harmony with the remainder. Effectual calling, regeneration, perseverance of the saints, are all linked in with the divine decree. The most cursory perusal will show that a revision of the Confession on this subject would amount to an entire recasting of the creed.

This is the exact truth in the case. Unless the Calvinism of the creed is extracted, it is not worth while to make any changes. Extract the Calvinism, and it will not be worth while to save what is left. A new creed on an Arminian basis will then be in demand; or, better still, the New Testament itself may find favor as an all-sufficient standard of faith and life.

Dr. Shedd's defence of the Calvinism of the Confession will be certain to have an effect exactly opposite to that which he desired. Calvinism so frankly and nakedly

expressed will not do in this age of the world's progress. He says :

Take an illustration. An able minister and divine, whose Calvinism is unimpeachable, suggests that Confession iii. 3, shall read : " By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained [for their sins] to everlasting death." If the clause in brackets is inserted without further explanation, the article might fairly and naturally be understood to teach that the reason why God passes by a sinner in the bestowment of regenerating grace is the sinner's sin. But St. Paul expressly says that the sinner's sin is not the cause of his non-election to regeneration. " The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, it was said, the elder shall serve the younger. Esau have I hated" (Rom. ix. 11, 13). The reason for the difference between the elect and non-elect is not the holiness or the sin of either of them, but God's sovereign good pleasure. " He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy and whom he will he hardeneth" (Rom. ix. 18). An explanation like this, without further explanation such as the proposer would undoubtedly make, would not only contradict Scripture, but change the Calvinistic doctrine into the Arminian. The reason for non-election would no longer be secret and sovereign, but known and conditional.

Dr. Shedd understands the Confession correctly on this subject. The writer who proposed to make the Confession say that " some men and angels are foreordained unto everlasting death" *for their sins*, was seeking to insert the Arminian doctrine of election into a Calvinistic creed—perhaps without knowing it. " For their sins" makes the reprobation conditional. Prof. Shedd gives the unconditional doctrine correctly when he says above, " The reason for the difference between the elect and the non-elect is *not the holiness or the sin of either of them, but God's sovereign good pleasure.*" " This doctrine runs entirely through the Westminster documents," as Prof. Shedd declares, and it is useless to patch this old garment with the new cloth of conditional election.

But is it not a terrible doctrine, that of unconditional reprobation ? Think of it : God did not foreordain men to everlasting death "*for their sins*," but on account of his " sovereign good pleasure !" Though in the end he will actually deliver sinners unto everlasting death *for their sins*. Why this difference ? Why determine to do it for one reason, and in the end actually accomplish it for another ? Why is such an awful end unconditional in purpose and conditional in execution ? This will never do. Such an unconditional decree will utterly break down in the judgment when all men, good and bad, will be disposed of according to what they have done. An unconditional salvation and reprobation in *purpose*, in a

past eternity, can never be made to harmonize with a conditional salvation and reprobation, in *reality*, in a coming eternity. One or the other will break down. It will be the first. God *purposed* to save and condemn men as he actually saves and condemns—that is, conditionally. He conditions salvation on our faithfulness to his word, and condemns on account of our unfaithfulness. He is a bold theologian who will declare that God elected and reprobated men, whom he pleased, without any reference to these conditions, or who will say, as does Dr. Shedd, that " the reason for the difference between the elect and the non-elect is not the holiness or the sin of either of them, but God's sovereign good pleasure ?" Yet this is Calvinism pure and simple.

TOM PAINE'S BIBLE.

BY REV. JOHN G. HALL, D.D.

From *The Illustrated Christian Weekly*, New York, Oct. 12, 1889.

THAT Tom Paine had a Bible, is certain. That he knew what was in it, is what he himself largely makes known. And that he did not always read it to carp and cavil, but rather often to indorse and quote it is what anyone may see who examines his famous Revolutionary writings. In 1792 the " Websters," of Albany, then among the leading book publishers of the land, issued by subscription a volume of these writings, embracing " Common Sense," " Public Good," " The Rights of Man," etc., which was largely patronized by prominent persons throughout the States, such as Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts ; James Madison, of Virginia ; DeWitt Clinton, of New York ; Rev. Samuel Kirkland, the famous missionary to the Oneidas, and very many others of similar social and religious standing.

The design of " Common Sense," first printed in 1776, was to justify to the world the step that the American colonies had taken for their Independence, and to brace up the colonists themselves to the great project they had in hand. And to accomplish those ends he manifestly resorted to the most cogent and unanswerable arguments within his reach, and which, as we perceive, he gathered profusely from the Bible. In depreciating a kingly form of government, he finely says : " Government by kings was first introduced to the world by the heathens, from whom the children of Israel copied the custom. . . . As the exalting one man so

greatly
the eq
be def
for the
Gideon
disapp
der un
is no
for th
king,
mans.

And
tensiv
pione
quent
God f
dissua
he see
name
reader
capita
not ru
you.

And f
lation
whole
tals,
pleas
king
the L
'Hea
that
reject
THAT

And
Jews
of hi
mon
thori
esty,
deals
that
his e
am r
Pain
and
the b
dign
effect

T
bers
of t
point
It w
such
agai
an c
in h
In
How

greatly above the rest cannot be justified on the equal rights of nature, so neither can it be defended on the authority of Scripture, for the will of the Almighty as declared by Gideon, and the prophet Samuel, expressly disapproves of government by kings. *Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's*, is no support of monarchical government, for the Jews at that time were without a king, and in a state of vassalage to the Romans."

And from this point, he goes into an extensive rehearsal of the Jewish history, in its pioneer Republican period, and in its subsequent ones of monarchical rule, showing how God favored the former, and vainly tried to dissuade his people from the latter. And he seems especially to aim to have God's name and sayings arrest the eye of the reader, by putting them frequently in double capitals; as in Gideon's answer: "I will not rule you, neither shall my son rule over you. **THE LORD SHALL RULE OVER YOU.**" And from the recorded debate and expostulation of Samuel with the people he quotes whole pages and does not spare double capitals, as in the following: "The thing displeased Samuel when they said, 'Give us a king to judge us;' and Samuel prayed to the Lord, and the Lord said unto Samuel, 'Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee, for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me **THAT I SHOULD NOT RULE OVER THEM.**'"

And from this ancient instance of the Jews, which he plants as the chief fulcrum of his logical lever, he goes on to oppose monarchy in all its pretences to a Divine authority or warrant. And the manifest honesty, sincerity, and zeal with which he so deals, is very striking and impressive; so that a modern reader may be inclined to rub his eyes and say, "Is this Tom Paine that I am reading?" Yes, we answer; it is Tom Paine bending himself down, in his earlier and less intemperate days, before his Bible; the book that he there exalts to the highest dignity, and quotes with great freedom and effect.

Take the following from one of his numbers of "The Crisis": "The natural right of the continent to be independent, is a point that never yet was called in question. It will not even admit of a debate. To deny such a right would be a kind of atheism against nature; and the best answer to such an objection would be, '*The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God.*'"

In one of his scathing letters to Lord Howe, he curiously writes: "Not many

days ago, I accidentally fell in company with a person of this city (Philadelphia), noted for espousing your cause, and on my remarking to him that it appeared clear to me, by the late providential turn of affairs, that God Almighty was on our side, he replied, 'We care nothing for that,' etc." And to the same conscientious British General, he again says: "The poor reflection of having served your king, will yield you no consolation in your dying moments. He will crumble to the same undistinguishable ashes with yourself, and have sins enough of his own to answer for. You may, perhaps, be willing to be serious, but the destruction of the goods of Providence, this havoc of the human race, this sowing the world with mischief, must be accounted for to Him who made and governs it." Bravo! Tom Paine. You had not read your Bible for naught.

And then further on, he says: "I have as little superstition in me as any man living, but my secret opinion has ever been, and still is, that God Almighty will not give up a people to military destruction, or leave them unsupportedly to perish, who had so earnestly and so repeatedly sought to avoid the calamities of war, by every decent method that wisdom could invent. Neither have I so much of the infidel in me as to suppose that He has relinquished the government of the world and given us up to the care of devils."

Here, also, his Bible comes up to the surface. And probably there was no time in his subsequent pitiful career when he could keep all thoughts of the Holy Book out of his mind and memory; and especially when those days came on, in which, as he himself says to Lord Howe, "Life began to wear a clouded look," and when he knew that his worn-out body was near to "crumble to the same undistinguished dust," with all lords and monarchs whose souls had fled to their last account. Poor man! Had he followed his Bible as closely in morals as he did in politics, he would have reached a more honorable earthly end, and doubtless also a happier lot in the world beyond.

JOHN CHINAMAN.

BY REV. DANIEL MARCH, D.D.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Oct. 31, 1889.

JOHN CHINAMAN is the greatest mystery in our common humanity. Judged after Western ways of thinking, he is a great contradiction. He is versatile, ingenious, irre-

pressible, and yet he is the slave of tradition; he gets little advantage from his ingenuity, and he plods on in the same beaten track for ages. He transgresses the prime laws of health and longevity, and yet he works hard; he is almost insensible to pain, and he lives long. He sleeps in close rooms, he breathes bad air, makes a block of wood his pillow, and the dusty floor or the damp ground his bed. And yet he is more healthy than many who take the utmost pains to get fresh air and clean lodgings and comfortable beds. He carries burdens heavy enough to crush ordinary men, and yet he grows strong from the overtaking of his strength, and he never complains of the hard tasks put upon him. He eats all manner of unpalatable and indigestible food, and yet he thrives on his hard living, and his stomach seldom gives way under the pressure put upon it. He works all day in the paddy field up to his knees in mud and water; and the sign in his language which is the symbol of happiness is a mouthful of rice. When he would salute his friend with the blessing of peace in the morning, he asks if he has eaten his rice to-day. He smokes opium and tobacco, and he practices vices which cannot be named in delicate speech, and yet he has the most vitality of all the peoples of the East. He pulls out his beard with tweezers, shaves the front and back of his head with razors, and lets the hair on his crown grow as long as it will of itself, and then he splices it out with false hair to make it longer. He exposes his bare head and beardless face to the fierce rays of the sun, and yet I never heard of a Chinaman's getting a sunstroke. He works on ships, boats, and steamers, he runs on errands, draws the *jinricksha*, drives dog-carts and carriages, pushes wheelbarrows and tow-lines, and employers say he is just the man for the job when there is hard work to be done.

Sometimes he seems so dull that impatient people cannot get along with him, and yet he is so useful that nobody can do without him. He has a great reputation for lying and stealing in his own country, and just as great a reputation for honesty and truth-speaking in Java and Japan. He packs close on the cooly ship for the long voyage to Australia and the islands of the South Seas, he has no exercise on shipboard, he keeps under decks, he eats the coarsest food, and he comes out well and cheerful at the end of the voyage. He builds railroads and highways and canals, he works farms and mines and machines until he makes the owners rich, and then he is told he is not want-

ed any longer; he must go, and give place to men who do less work and demand more pay. He wears his blue cotton in all climates, and he faces all extremes of heat and cold without whiskey to keep him warm and without ice water to keep him cool. He gets rich when others starve, he keeps healthy when others die, he is quiet and cheerful when others are mourning and complaining, he is peaceful when others quarrel, he is industrious when others are idle and lazy, he flies kites and fights crickets like rude boys, and he cools himself with a fan as if he were the most effeminate of all people. And yet he endures more hardship, and suffers more abuse, than any other people on the face of the earth, unless the African can be an exception. He is kicked and cuffed and snubbed by blustering John Bull and bragging Brother Jonathan, he is ridiculed and laughed at by all Western nations; and yet he comes up smiling from every fall, and he makes money out of the people who abuse and banish him.

The Chinaman's country is overcrowded with people. He thinks it the fairest and the most favored of all the lands of the earth, the only land worth living in, the only dust fit to be buried in, and yet he emigrates to all quarters of the globe; he appears to be contented wherever he is, and homesickness is a disease of which Chinamen never die. He mounts on the wrong side of his horse, and yet he rides well when he gets into the saddle; he makes the compass point the wrong way, and yet his junk seldom gets lost on the sea. He begins at the wrong end of his book to read, and he reads backwards, and yet he has been printing and reading books in his own language longer than any other people in the world.

According to our theories and ways of judging, the Chinaman is a great contradiction. He lives and thrives and multiplies, when he ought to fade and waste away and die. His tools are clumsy, his methods of working are awkward and ill adapted to what he tries to do, his taste is unrefined and unnatural. And yet in his line he makes the best work, and he underbids all manufacturers in the market of the world, while securing a good profit to himself. He pays divine honors to his deceased parents; he worships the god of money, and yet he has little pity for the suffering and the needy; he is cruel and brutal in his punishments; he murders his own children to relieve himself of the burden of supporting them. He paints landscapes without perspective, carves images of animals that never existed, incurs

vast ex
has no
day by
burns p
decease
try fro
Chinan
seems
home s
comes
govern
pathies
tions a
and ou
past, a
distant
teent
ancien
fierce
and th

The
this er
us wh
the m
not be
that w
tries
halls,
get w
Christ
essays
the W
what
cultur
civiliz

B
From

Ev
scien
to ph
I hav
fectiv
could
ing a
and,
Scrip
as no
water
and
view
Chu
visio
come
is r
chur
is so

vast expense in support of a religion that has no God. He celebrates his father's birthday by presenting him with a coffin, and he burns paper money to pay the expense of his deceased mother in her journey to the country from which none ever return. The Chinaman, go where he will, contented as he seems to be everywhere, is really never at home save in his own country; he never becomes a citizen or a subject of any other government than his own. He has no sympathies with the great philosophies, inventions and progressive ideas of our country and our day. He lives on, a relic of the past, a moving and breathing mummy of far distant generations, as if to tell the nineteenth century how the great nations of the ancient world would look if seen in "the fierce light which beats upon the thrones" and the peoples of the West.

The Chinese stand before the world, in this enlightened and progressive age, to tell us what would have been the condition of the most cultivated nations to-day, had it not been for the birth of the divine Child that was born in Bethlehem eighteen centuries ago. When students in cloistered halls, and theorists in schools of philosophy, get weary of culture and dissatisfied with Christian civilization, and write books and essays to show that life is not worth living in the West, let them go to the far East and see what life they have been lifted out of by the culture of which they are weary and the civilization with which they are not satisfied.

REVISION.

BY REV. JAMES M'COSH, D.D., LL.D.

From *The Herald and Presbyter*, Cincinnati, Oct. 9, 1889.

EVER since I became a teacher of the science of mind I have given more attention to philosophy than theology. In doing this, I have been able to serve religion more effectively than by any other course which I could take. My philosophy is realistic, being an exposition of the facts of our nature, and, being so, it must be favorable to the Scriptures, which reveal to us what we are as no other work has done. But I have been watching all along the signs of the times, and feel it to be honest to make known my views in every crisis of opinion in the Church. Hitherto I have not favored a revision of our Standards, but the time has come when we must face the question which is now being put in the Presbyterian churches all over the world. I know there is some risk in stirring up the inquiry, but

there is more danger in trying to ignore or suppress it—which, in fact, cannot now be done. Our students, our young men generally, and our laity, are raising the question, and it is the plain duty of the Church to face it boldly and to guide the movement in the right direction. There are some passages in the Confession of Faith and in the Larger Catechism of which it may be doubted whether they are founded on the word of God, and which are offensive in their expression. Further, there is a want of a clear and prominent utterance, such as we have in the Scriptures, of the love of God, as shown in the redemption of Christ, which is sufficient for all men, and in the free and honest offer of salvation to all men, non-elect as well as elect. For the last thirty-nine years of my life my intercourse has been chiefly with young men, who are apt to open their hearts to me as knowing that I sympathize with them. Most of our young men have not paid much attention to the Confession, but they will now do so, and as they do so they will find certain passages knotty, crabbed and hard to digest. I do fear that some of our best young men, who meant to become ministers, may be allured away to other professions, and that those who go on to preach the gospel will find themselves annoyed and hindered by unwarranted expressions staring them in the face. In these circumstances I am of opinion that the Church should as speedily as possible leave out a few obnoxious passages not at all needful to the completeness of the expression of the system of doctrine, and put in the very front a full declaration of God's love to men and a free offer of salvation. This being done for the present, the Church should hold itself ready to meet the wants of the years and ages as they roll on. I am not sure whether the present terms of subscription to the Standards will be sufficient in the distant, or even in the near future. Some of our younger men are saying: "Nobody believes all the Confession; everybody rejects some parts; I may reject what displeases me." At this present time we get more than half our erudition from Germany, but also more than one-half of our heresies. Our Confession meets the heresies of the seventeenth, but not the more insidious ones of the nineteenth century. The Church has now to see that it has professors in our seminaries equal in learning to those in Germany. Ever since the Reformation, the Church has been amending its Confession. I confess that I should like to have in the Presbyterian Church a shorter and simpler creed than the Westminster Confession. At

the same time our creed, be it shorter, or be it longer, must contain all the saving truths embraced in the consensus of the churches. I believe that in the age on which we have now entered, the Church will have to engage in a fight for "the faith once delivered to the saints." I hold that the Presbyterian Church is quite fit for that work. I deny that the great body of its ministers are Arminian or half-Arminian. I deny that Charles Hodge or Alexander Hodge have departed from the Confession of Faith. They may differ at times in the aspect they present and the phrases they use, but the truths are the same—those of the old Pauline theology. It was my privilege some years ago to bring all the evangelical Presbyterian churches throughout the world into an Alliance. To accomplish this, I crossed the Atlantic Ocean three or four times, corresponded with hundreds of individuals and with dozens of churches. In drawing out the Constitution of the Alliance, I took pains to let each church have its own creed. In the agitation now raised, each church will have to consider what is to be its Confession. Meanwhile, I trust the churches will correspond with one another and each help the other. This will not be done this year or next year, but will be the work of years to come. As the issue there will be a closer union and a wider extension of the Presbyterian churches all over the world.

PRINCETON, N. J., Oct. 1, 1889.

SICK PRAYER-MEETINGS.

BY REV. THEODORE L. CUYLER.

From *The Evangelist* (Presbyterian), New York, Oct. 24, 1889.

THE best place to feel the spiritual pulse of a Church is the prayer-meeting. If that is full of life, warmth, and vigor, then the Church is healthy; if the prayer-meeting declines, then the whole body is apt to suffer from this disease at the heart. The circulation of warm blood is impeded; devotion, which is the breath of the Church, becomes feeble, and pretty soon the "extremities" grow cold, as in the case of a dying man.

Prayer-meetings, like human bodies, are subject to a variety of diseases. Sometimes they suffer for want of a nourishing diet. No themes or topics are introduced to quicken thought, or arouse devotion, and the meeting is starved to a skeleton. But if some rousing practical topic is introduced; above all, if the vital truths of God's Word are presented, then the meeting has some-

thing to feed upon. The Holy Spirit honors the service that honors His precious Word. People run dry; even the best soon talk themselves out (and talk other people out of the house too), unless their souls are replenished from God's inexhaustible storehouse of wisdom, knowledge, and quickening power. Let the leader of the meeting choose some central truth or some enlivening practical passage of God's Word, and invite the people to come and talk about it, and weave it into their prayers. The weekly gatherings of Christians should be instructive as well as devotional. The pastor is not supposed to be the only man who is well up in Bible knowledge; some private Christians get insights into the "deep things of God" that a minister has not yet discovered. On the evenings when special prayer is made for the evangelization of the world ("Monthly Concerts" they used to be called), the meeting ought to be fed with fresh information from the missionary fields. If nothing is carried into the meeting, very little will be carried out. I suspect that a large proportion of church members saunter into their prayer-rooms in a listless, haphazard fashion, trusting that somebody else will have brought "five loaves or a few small fishes" for the evening's repast. They do not even carry a felt want, a fervent desire, a spiritual hunger there; they are apt to bring nothing and to carry nothing away. Scores of prayer-meetings starve to death. How can it be expected that unconverted persons or young people will ever be attracted to a meeting in which there is nothing to interest them, or even keep them awake? A devotional meeting is no more a self-feeding apparatus than a human body is; its supplies must come from God's Word, and the presence of the Holy Spirit, and from the experiences which the Spirit has awakened.

Many other prayer-meetings are suffering from what the doctors call "general debility." They have run down. The few people who do attend them, hear only the same stereotyped remarks, and the same stereotyped prayers week after week. The blood has been slowly drained away from the meeting until it has reached the last stages of consumption. A is too busy to attend the meetings any more. B is too tired after his day's work. C has her round of social engagements. D goes to his club, and E to his political headquarters, and F cares more to stay at home and read his newspaper. And so from the whole alphabet of delinquents comes the same "I pray thee have me excused." The faithful few

who ne
posts;
pray;
sent.
makes
its slow

"W
church
for an
haps w
come a
"Peo
get up
brothe
the pr
there
churc
You a
freeze
of all
clin
lom o
cause
if it c
better
by th
their
the d
heav
them
ent c
"fac
place
come
ister
the
com
bles
Unt
ame
clin
sici

TH

From

Th

Th

S

the

Ste

mi

it

acr

Or

co

mi

dic

on

who need the meeting the *least* are at their posts; the unfaithful majority who need to pray, and to be prayed for the *most* are absent. The feeble prayer-meeting not only makes the pastor's heart sick, but it sends its slow paralysis through the whole Church.

"What is the matter with us?" says one church member. "Had we not better look for another minister?" says another. "Perhaps we had better invite an evangelist to come and *revive* us," suggests a third brother. "People are attracted by fine music; let us get up a fine choir," suggests an aesthetic brother, who attends the opera generally on the prayer-meeting evening. Good friends, there is no mystery about the state of your church. You are drifting away from God! You are freezing to death, as people always freeze when they get too far from the source of all heat and life. That poor, sickly, declining prayer-meeting, is not merely a *symptom* of a declining church; it is one great *cause* of your decline. Revival and recovery, if it come at all, must come there, and had better begin there. The few who have stayed by the mercy-seat all along should direct their prayers "at a mark," and that is for the descent of the Holy Spirit as a fire from heaven. The deserters, who have brought themselves and the church also into its present diseased and enfeebled condition, must "face about," and go back to their deserted place of duty. Returning health cannot come from pulpit or music-loft, from minister or evangelist: it can only come *from* the Lord Jesus Christ, and it will only come *to* those who penitently pray for the blessing, and are ready to work to secure it. Until that sick prayer-meeting begins to amend, there is not much hope for your declining church. *Call for the Great Physician there!*

THE SUPERINTENDENT'S WORK.

BY THE REV. J. C. FERNALD.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, Oct. 19, 1889.

THE superintendent should superintend. That is what he is for.

Scattered forces accomplish little. Often they antagonize and neutralize each other. Steam, left to itself, fizzles idly away, and mingles with the air. Directed, compacted, it moves the engine's arms of steel, flying across the land, or throbbing amid the seas. On earth the only force that organizes and compacts other forces is some one human mind. A host of volunteers, brave as ever died for liberty, turn into headlong rout at one battle, for want of one mind that could

mass and direct their valor. Another host conquer at another battle, because one man could move their battalions in harmony like the fingers of his hand. There are families where the only gifts that seem to be developed are combativeness and destructiveness. The members instinctively bristle at sight of each other. There are other families, no richer, no better educated—as regards what the schools can teach—whose members never seem to have any temper, and instinctively to find the goodness, beauty, and power of all the rest. What is the secret of it?

There is a quiet little mother, who does not seem, many times, to be doing so very much, but to be pretty much everywhere. She deftly ties up a cut finger; she glues on a doll's head; she finds a string for the irrepressible four-year-old to play horse with, to give him motion enough; and gets the tired little two-year-old to sit down on the rug and find the glorious pictures in an old *Century*, where a battle-field turns into a show of fine horses, and a soap advertisement becomes a lovely baby-picture with a thrilling story attached. In the midst of all, a thousand domestic occupations go on, each receiving at the right moment a touch of the achieving hand, or the guidance of a directing word.

Let that magical person depart, and a strong man wrestle with the problem, and try to find the things that are all out of sight, and all wanted, and all wanted right away. Some imperceptible mismanagement finds unsuspected tempers, as the claws in the cat's soft foot come out when you stroke her fur the wrong way. The wearied man comes from the herculean exertion with the conviction of what a wonderful thing it is to organize a home. That is just what we want of a superintendent—to organize a school, and keep the organization in smooth, effective working order all the time.

This work of leadership is the greatest work man does on earth, and in which he most reflects the image of the Lord God omnipotent. It is much to do the whole work of one man or one woman. It is more to organize the work of many. He who can do this can work in many places at once. He accomplishes the mathematical impossibility of acting where he is not. He realizes the fable of the giant Briareus, and has a hundred hands. He can give other people's money—with their most hearty consent. He can pour out upon the world the riches of learning on matters which he does not understand—all by knowing whom to set to doing the thing that most needs to be done.

The superintendent should know what each teacher is capable of; how many scholars can be profitably taught in one class; when an overgrown class can be divided, and when the attempt to do so would only scatter it to the four winds; when scholars should be promoted; what classes will be congenial to new-comers, and where such would be like fishes out of water, to keep very far from that shore ever after.

I am reminded of a little adventure on one of the six-horse White Mountain stages. Our driver was a genuine specimen of the tall, lank, slab-sided Yankee, with a thin face that looked as if it might have been cut out of an oak plank, but a pair of keen gray eyes that were wonderfully alive. The stage rolled smoothly along, with the leaders often out of sight around the turns, the green branches dipping down and brushing our faces as we sat on the top—a precipice often going sheer down on one side, and a bank rising sheer up on the other. Our Jehu did not seem to be doing anything in particular, and nothing appeared easier or simpler than to drive a six-horse stage as he did it. Beside him sat a short, fat, important man, who "talked horse" incessantly, giving a good many hints and suggestions to the young driver, which he received good-naturedly, but with a little air of amusement. At length the stage stopped at a bridge over a mountain stream. The driver handed the lines to the horseman beside him, saying, "Just hold these while I give 'em some water." He took a bucket from under the rail of the bridge, filled it at the stream, and gave each horse a drink, very carefully and deliberately hung his bucket back, climbed into his seat, and clucked to his horses, saying to his self-important friend, "You just drive 'em a little, while I put on my gloves." It took him a long while to draw on those gauntlet gloves, the horses meanwhile listening backward, tossing their heads, biting at each other, and going each for himself, no two pulling together. The road appeared to be full of ruts, and the coach to find them all. It rolled like a ship at sea, and the great trunks began to shift and strain in their fastenings.

The driver had at length got those gloves on. A dry smile wrinkled his cheek like a summer breeze on water. He put his hand down and picked up the long whip, the lash all coiled around the stock, and began unrolling it to the breeze. The ambitious substitute, now flushed and anxious, turned to him with a despairing "Oh, don't!" But the long lash floated out behind the coach,

and came back with a sharp crack behind the leaders' ears. The whole team plunged, but in six different directions, and the man who held the reins reached them over helplessly to the real driver, saying, "Here, take 'em." He slipped them between his fingers, worked quietly with them a minute or two, shortening one here, loosening another there. The horses felt some magical change. Each pair came up evenly to their collars, pricked their ears forward, and bent their heads toward each other, with an air that said, "This is all right." The leaders flashed by the wayside bushes where the boughs brushed their fine ears, the next pair came with taut traces in their steps, and the strong wheelers settled to their heavy work with an air of perfect contentment. The coach rolled smoothly again, somehow missing all the rocks and ruts that had been so numerous before. The driver smiled his dry smile once more, and called out to them encouragingly, "There, children, your father's got home again!" Then, turning to the disappointed man beside him, he said good-naturedly, "'Tain't any wonder a stranger can't do it. He don't know the critters' mouths, nor yet their dispositions."

To hold all the lines of the school well in hand, all drawing, and none strained, and to guide the whole enterprise smoothly and speedily along the road of righteousness, is the greatest work a superintendent can do.

Let us take his hour. He has studied the lesson as faithfully as any teacher. He comes to the school in ample time. He looks rapidly over the field as the school assembles, noting what teachers are in their places, and who may be absent, and whether the absent have provided a substitute, as he impresses it upon them that they should do, unless he is notified in time to provide one before the session. Yet he keeps always in mind some whom he may call upon to teach in an unforeseen emergency. He rapidly decides what he will do if the expected teachers do not come. He reverently conducts the reading of the lesson, or, better if possible, of some related Scripture, if the school are provided with Bibles, as they should be. He makes sure all papers needed are promptly on hand. He suggests to secretary and librarian anything needed in their departments. While the teaching is going on, he silently reviews his army, noting what classes are interested, which keep full, seeing that no visitor, young or old, fails of a kind invitation to a seat in some class. Sometimes he steps into the infant class, says some kind word to the little ones, possibly tells a brief story to impress some

though
by the
to get
sugges
plexing
as he l
or five
though
clearly
teache
he sha
ners,
with
the le
says a
any a
one m
hopef
school
world

W
ently
pray
oppo
of th
ars.
room
disc
ful
the
cou
of s
am
into
Chr
he
sch

Pro

"
us
m

re
th
D
n
th
m
d
f

v
v
f

thought of the lesson. Sometimes he stops by the Bible class or some other long enough to get the run of the teaching, to ask some suggestive question, or answer some perplexing one. He closes as sharply on time as he begins. If he sees reason for a three or five-minute talk, to impress some serious thought or some practical duty, he speaks clearly, kindly, and so briefly that the teachers and scholars have no anxiety lest he shall keep them too long from their dinners, or from another service. He closes with a selected hymn true to the heart of the lesson. When the school breaks up, he says a kind word here and there, learns if any absent scholars are sick, etc. As far as one man can, he sends all away cheerful and hopeful, and with the feeling that their school is one of the dearest places in the world.

When he goes home, he takes all reverently to the Captain of salvation in fervent prayer, and all the week does all that life's opportunities allow him for the prosperity of the school and the salvation of the scholars. He has a friendly visit to some sick-room, a hopeful, inspiring talk with some discouraged teacher, a few kindly, thoughtful words with some young man or boy in the midst of the city's temptations or discouraged with the seemingly thankless work of some lonely farm. None can measure the amount of good that can be done by a superintendent who is a superintendent and a Christian all the time. In school and out, he is the unifying force to make the whole school act together as the heart of one man.

NEW YORK CITY.

THE NICENE CREED AND THE "FILIOQUE."

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, Oct. 12, 1889.

By the action of the General Convention "the Nicene Creed" must henceforth be used in the celebration of the Holy Communion at least five times in the year.

The debate on this subject was in some respects unsatisfactory. Notwithstanding the admirable precision of the language of Dr. Kedney and other speakers, an erroneous impression was created in some minds that the doctrine of the Church was the matter at issue, and in the reports of the daily press statements to that effect were freely made.

We need not assure the readers of the *Churchman* that no question of doctrine was really involved in the action of the Convention. In all Catholic Churches it has for ages been customary to recite the Nicene

Creed at the celebration of the Holy Communion. The action of the American Church a hundred years ago in leaving it optional with the clergy to use or omit that creed was regarded in England as a serious mistake. The present action which requires it to be said on certain days only, is merely a restoration in part of the former law of the Church, and still falls far short of the established custom in most parishes.

The objection to the measure was not grounded on a disbelief of the creed as it stands, since a large majority of those who opposed it have no objection whatever to the use of the same creed in other services of the Church. We regret that their side of the discussion was not more satisfactorily represented. The history of the clause, "Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son" was not clearly nor even accurately given; and if it had been better set forth, it is possible that the final vote on the question might have been less sweeping than it was. The anathema of the Council of Ephesus does not apply to the western form of the creed, since that form is not in the least particular inconsistent with "the faith of Nicæa." The definition of the Council of Chalcedon, however, condemns not only deviations from that "faith," but also every variation from the "symbol," that is to say, the very identical form of the Constantinopolitan Creed, which was expressly read, approved and set forth at Chalcedon, together with that of Nicæa. It is on that ground that the Orientals so strenuously object to the words "and the Son" which have been inserted by western Christians. Even the Orientals admit that there is a sense in which those words are true, namely, that the Holy Spirit, "Who proceedeth from the Father," is also sent by the Son; but they insist that no provincial, national, or patriarchal division of the Church Catholic has a right to add one syllable to the formula established by the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon. The reunion of the Churches of the East and the West will probably never be possible until that cause of difference shall have been removed.

If we rightly understand the position of those who oppose the action of the Convention, and we think we do understand the mind of the most learned men among them, it is not to the creed itself, as an expression of belief, that they objected, but to the introduction into the Holy Communion of a form of words which many millions of Catholic Christians could not conscientiously use. To its use in other services of the Church the same objection does not exist. No one

is obliged by any divine law to join in those services; and if they contain anything to which he cannot on catholic grounds assent, he is at liberty to absent himself from them. The Holy Communion, however, is of divine institution, and to participate in it is a duty of divine obligation. It has therefore been felt by many eminent persons both in England and America that unless the very formula of the Council of Chalcedon could be used in the celebration of the Holy Communion, it would be better not to use a formula which to many millions of Christians is a cause of offence.

This opinion has weight in itself and also in the character of some of its advocates; and we should have been rejoiced to hear it somewhat more clearly set forth in the House of Deputies. To those who are disappointed at the final action of the Convention because of the offence to the Orientals there ought at least to be some consolation in the fact that the American Church at least does not stand apart from the rest of the Occident.

At any rate and however much the public press may have misunderstood, and therefore misrepresented, the discussion the doctrine of the Church was not brought into question in connection with this matter.

THAT EVENING CONGREGATION.

From *The Advance* (Congregationalist), Chicago, Oct. 31, 1889.

THE paucity of the number composing the evening congregations at most of our churches forms the theme of lamentations as common as they are mournful. Preachers of distinguished ability, whose congregations in the morning number a thousand or more, seem obliged to be content in the evening with a congregation of two hundred or one hundred, or even less. That fact is evident, that to hear the best preaching of the best preachers the people of the churches will not come of a Sabbath evening.

The explanation of the fact is also evident. The explanation we believe to be in large part this: the people of the larger churches in the cities live in all parts of those cities. They are not willing to take themselves away from their homes for the sake of coming to church. They feel that the duties they owe their children and the duties they owe their homes are more important than the duties they owe their church of attending a second service. We cannot question the fact, and the character of most of those people who thus absent themselves prevents us from discrediting their motives. There

are those who seriously fear that the second service, as a service of worship for the people of the church, is gone, and gone not to return.

In this condition the minister is subject to temptations of diverse character and power. He is tempted to feel that in one respect his work is a failure, and he is inclined to withdraw from his ministry. We know of one prominent minister, formerly the pastor of a prominent church of this city, who frequently vowed to himself on returning from his thinly attended evening service, that he would offer his resignation the next Sabbath morning. We sympathize with the minister who is thus tempted. The temptation is strong. He feels that his church is not loyal to him as he represents the cause of Christ.

The minister is also subjected to the temptation to introduce into his pulpit unworthy subjects for treatment, or to introduce unworthy methods of treating worthy subjects. He is tempted to become sensational in the worst sense of a bad word. He is also tempted to try to cajole the people away from their sitting-rooms in the evening by praise services, courses of sermons on the patriarchs, and attempts to solve the problems of the political economy. Usually he runs the gamut of these various methods. Each for a time works well, but each in the end works badly. At last he is left in a condition not worse than he was at first, but in very much the same condition.

We believe, however, that the minister should yield to one allurements which is offered to him, and that is the allurements to make his Sunday evening services popular by preaching the Gospel. Let him endeavor to bring in those who are without, let him strive to make the church attractive in the evening to that great class of people who have no regular church home, or who are unable for any reason to come to the morning services. We would have him use every right means for making the service worthy of the people. We would not suggest to him to preach upon sensational themes, or to preach the Gospel in a sensational way; but we would have him preach those doctrines which usually cluster about the word salvation. We are confident that if the evening service is to be saved to the people, it must be saved in a legitimate way. Any other way of saving it is too costly.

The question of the size of the evening congregation at any one church is not the important question that it is usually thought to be. It is an important question, but two other questions are much more important;

one, the instruction which the congregation that does assemble receives, the other, that the dignity of the church is not sacrificed in gathering the congregation. A minister sometimes purchases success for himself in his evening service through degrading the influence of the church and lessening the power of the Gospel. The minister who draws congregations by unworthy methods is thereby hurting every other minister to draw a congregation by worthy methods. The Congregational minister who fills his pews in the evening by preaching upon the prayer-cure, or the telephone, or the telegraph, or "a tour of the cities of Europe," is hurting every other Congregational pulpit in the land, and preventing it from doing its legitimate work in a legitimate way. We believe that the minister who thus draws congregations pays a price too high either for his own interest, or for the interest of the church, Congregational and universal.

Although we have expressed our opinion that no legitimate means will suffice to bring out large congregations in the evening composed of the regular worshippers, yet we do express our opinion that it is the duty of many of the regular worshippers to come to the Sabbath evening service. The church cannot do its duty to those who are without, by means of a public service, except those who are within attend the same service. A minister may preach never so eloquently and attractively and persuasively, if the regular attendants are absent from the service, he cannot deal with those who may be touched by his message, as they ought to be dealt with. The service of Sabbath evening should be of that character to necessitate the second or after-meeting. But this after-meeting is almost of no use, is indeed practically impossible, except as the Christian members of the congregation help to conduct it. The evangelistic work of such a service depends upon workers; if the workers are absent, the work itself cannot be done.

"WHITHER?"

From *The Universalist*, Chicago, Oct. 26, 1889.

THE discussion which is now in progress among the Presbyterians regarding the revision of the Westminster Confession of Faith, bids fair to remove the theological storm centre from the Congregational to the Presbyterian body. It is likely that, as the debate moves on, it will transpire that the Presbyterians are as rapidly forsaking the ancient land-marks as their Congregational brethren. Heretofore it has been the con-

clusion that the new theology men were confined to the Congregationalists, but events are rapidly proving that the Presbyterians are not to be without an influential representation in the movement for the reconstruction of theology.

Presbyterianism has so long prided itself on adhering inflexibly to the old dogmas of the faith that it was urged some time ago, that in case the action of the American Board touching a future probation led to any unwillingness on the part of young men to enter the missionary service, the Presbyterian body could furnish from its theological seminaries young men in sufficient numbers, who were sound in the faith, to make up the deficiency. This was the result of the confidence which was cherished that the new heresy had made no perceptible inroads in the Presbyterian denomination. Recent developments go to prove that this confidence was not well founded, and that Presbyterianism itself has more in common than was supposed with the new movement among the Congregationalists.

One of the most significant developments in this direction is to be found in the volume entitled "Whither?" by Professor Charles A. Briggs, D.D., of the Union Theological Seminary, the Presbyterian institution of New York. Only published a few weeks, it is already discovered that this volume is packed full of heresy, and is a veritable bomb-shell in the camp of conservative Presbyterian divinity. Among other startling declarations, testifying to the movement of the new thought among the hitherto inflexible Presbyterians, Professor Briggs declares:

"If this life be a probation, then there is no ground in the Scriptures or in the Westminster symbols, or in sound reason, why this probation should not be extended into the middle state for those who have no probation here."

This declaration from so eminent a Presbyterian, cannot fail of precipitating the controversy touching the extent of probation into the front rank of controversy, and placing the Presbyterians on the defensive on the question which has almost rent the Congregationalists in twain. The high character and standing of Dr. Briggs, and the fact that he is a teacher in their leading theological seminary, which has been long the fortress of Calvinistic teaching under Dr. Shedd, will not only challenge attention to this explicit declaration, but must also bring the question of a second probation to the front for immediate discussion. And so the work goes on.

But it is not alone on this question of a future probation that "Whither?" will prove an epoch-making book among the Presbyterians. It also deals with the Westminster Confession, and the devotion which clings to that ancient document, in a very striking and suggestive manner. It meets the current argument of the Presbyterians that the Confession is too ancient and time-honored a symbol to be revised in this nineteenth century, by quoting from church history and eminent Presbyterian authorities, facts which go to prove that already, "more than half of the work of the Westminster divines has been entirely set aside," and that on many vital points of doctrine, the church has already departed from the original Presbyterian faith. These things have been urged over and over again in the debate between Liberals and Conservatives, but in Dr. Briggs's volume they assume a new importance and must initiate a momentous discussion among the Presbyterians.

The Presbyterians have always been quite indignant at Universalists and Unitarians for charging upon them the belief in the damnation of non-elect infants, and have contended that the Confession of Faith taught no such doctrine; that it was an unfair interpretation, and not to be justified by an appeal to the standards, when the original meaning was taken into account. Dr. Briggs makes short work with this plea. "We are able to say," he remarks, "that the Westminster divines were unanimous on the question of the salvation of elect infants only. We have examined the greater part of the writings of the Westminster divines and have not been able to find any different opinion from the extracts we have given. The Presbyterian churches have departed from their standards on this question, and it is simple honesty to acknowledge it. We are at liberty to amend the Confession, but we have no right to distort it and to pervert its grammatical and historical meaning." This from a special student of the Westminster standards, and the literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth century divines, is enough to put the veto hereafter on the disingenuous manner in which this doctrine has been usually defended by the Presbyterians.

There are many other important matters discussed in Dr. Briggs's book, but we can only notice the above points at present. His work is the result of twenty years' study of the Westminster standards in the light of the Westminster divines and their Puritan associates and precursors." On the questions noted above it will give the Pres-

byterians ample food for reflection, and cannot fail of stirring the waters to their utmost depths. Dr. Briggs is an advocate of progress in the Presbyterian ranks and proposes to "break the mould of doctrine" and set forth the vital and essential doctrines of Presbyterianism in a new form, more in consonance with the spirit of the age. With what success his work will be attended remains to be seen. "Whither?" is at all events, a remarkable volume, and will take its place among other volumes embodying the spirit of the nineteenth century, emanating from the orthodox church. It will be a companion for "Progressive Orthodoxy," by the Andover men, Munger's "Freedom of Faith," and Mulford's "Republic of God."

MR. BELLAMY'S PARABLE.

BY REV. HENRY M. KING, D.D.

From *The Standard* (Baptist), Chicago, Oct. 10, 1880.

MR. EDWARD BELLAMY's book, "Looking Backward," has attracted considerable attention and has had a remarkable sale. One hundred thousand copies have been called for in numerous editions. The author is reported to have said that originally it was undertaken as "a literary fantasy," with no thought of its being regarded as furnishing a basis for the solution of labor problems and for the reconstruction of society. That it has been accepted as an offered solution of the numerous and serious ills that afflict our social life is very evident. Mr. Bellamy is probably not a little amused at the serious treatment which his book has received at the hands of the public. But it is impossible now to divest the author's conception of the popular conception. Indeed the book must be treated in the light of the impression which it has produced.

The description of the social state in the year 2000 when the sleeper awakes from his long sleep in the subterranean chamber, is delightfully fanciful and ingenious. Many things then described as actual may now be looked upon as probable, in view of the marvellous progress of the last hundred years. Of course the author finds it convenient to leave many questions unanswered as to the working of the new social system. The reader must not be too inquisitive. He must be satisfied with the general outline and let alone the details. The general outline is certainly made very attractive by the author's skilful pen. It is not the picture so much as it is the looking backward that provokes criticism.

The book presents a condition of things without giving an adequate cause, a result without suggesting any sufficient forces to produce it, a sort of millennium without an antecedent gospel or a reigning Christ. It takes no fair account of the presence and power of sin as a disturbing element in society, or of the evil tendency, the depravity of human nature, deep-rooted and humanly indestructible, as an actual factor in the social problem. In a word, it rests upon the false assumption that, the outward circumstances being changed, the motives to sin are taken away and the tendencies to sin become inoperative; that environment is mightier than the law of heredity.

Let us now listen to the parable which sets forth the philosophy of "Looking Backward."

"To put the whole matter into the nutshell of a parable, let me compare humanity in the olden time to a rosebush planted in a swamp, watered by black bog-water, breathing miasmatic fogs by day and chilled with poison dews at night. Innumerable generations had done their best to make it bloom, but beyond an occasional half-opened bud with a worm at the heart, their efforts had been unsuccessful. Many, indeed, claimed that the bush was no rosebush at all, but a noxious shrub, fit only to be uprooted and burned. The gardeners, for the most part, however, held that the bush belonged to the rose family, but had some ineradicable taint about it, which prevented the buds from coming out, and accounted for its generally sickly condition. There were a few, indeed, who maintained that the stock was good enough, that the trouble was in the bog, and that under more favorable conditions the plant might be expected to do better. But these persons were not regular gardeners, and being condemned by the latter as mere theorists and day-dreamers, were, for the most part, so regarded by the people.

"Moreover, urged some eminent moral philosopher, even conceding for the sake of the argument, that the bush might possibly do better elsewhere, it was a more valuable discipline for the buds to try to bloom in a bog than it would be under more favorable conditions. The buds that succeeded in opening might indeed be rare, and the flowers pale and scentless, but they represented far more moral effort than if they had bloomed spontaneously in a garden.

"The regular gardeners and the moral philosophers had their way. The bush remained in the bog and the old course of treatment went on. Continually new varieties of forcing mixtures were applied to the

roots, and more recipes than could be numbered, each declared by its advocates the best and only suitable preparation, were used to kill the vermin and remove the mildew. This went on a very long time. Occasionally some one claimed to observe a slight improvement in the appearance of the bush, but there were quite as many who declared that it did not look as well as it used to. On the whole there could not be said to be any marked change.

"Finally, during a period of general despondency as to the prospects of the bush where it was, the idea of transplanting it was again mooted, and this time found favor. 'Let us try it,' was the general voice. 'Perhaps it may thrive better elsewhere, and here it is certainly doubtful if it be worth cultivating any longer.' So it came about that the rosebush of humanity was transplanted, and set in sweet, warm, dry earth, where the sun bathed it, the stars wooed it, and the south wind caressed it. Then it appeared that it was indeed a rosebush. The vermin and the mildew disappeared, and the bush was covered with most beautiful red roses, whose fragrance filled the world."

Such is the parable. It contains the author's theory of the improvement of humanity. Humanity is the rosebush now sickly and unfruitful. It only needs to change its environment to be made a perfect rosebush, and bear an abundance of beautiful roses. Some power outside of the rosebush must change its location. Some power residing in humanity must change its circumstances and all will be well. Humanity will be no longer sickly and unfruitful.

The parable is very beautiful and very specious. It has one weakness, it is utterly false to the facts in the case. The trouble is not with the soil, but with the rosebush. The rosebush was originally planted in the soil of Eden, and there it fell. It wasn't the bog that made the rosebush unfruitful, but it was the rosebush that made the bog rotten and miasmatic. A change of soil will not affect the nature of the bush. It will go on perverting the soil. New conditions, if they could be brought about, would soon become old conditions, unless the occupant be made new.

Mr. Bellamy's parable reminds us of another parable, one which God has given us in his Word. Let us now listen to that one.

"Now will I sing to my well-beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. My well-beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill, and he fenced it and gathered

out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and also made a winepress therein; and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes. And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem, and men of Judah, judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes brought it forth wild grapes?"

Such is God's parable. It is certainly implied that the vine was "set in sweet, warm, dry earth, where the sun bathed it, the stars wooed it, and the south wind caressed it." And yet notwithstanding its excellent care and its favorable environment, it brought forth wild grapes.

Which parable shall we accept? Which teaching is in harmony with the facts, and which will give us the true working theory of life? According to Mr. Bellamy, will not humanity find more comfort in looking backward from an imaginary future than in looking forward from an actual present? If we blind our eyes to the nature of the disease, all our prescriptions will be fallacious. No outward application can meet the necessities of the case. God's parable goes to the root of the matter, and the gospel of Christ is based upon the fact that what is needed is not a change of soil, but a change of soul.

It is true that there is a very general unrest and dissatisfaction with the condition of things. It is a good sign, a hopeful omen. Social disturbances and financial crises are certain to be followed by religious awakenings. Men are constrained to seek after rest and comfort in God and religion. They see the vanity of all things earthly. Their grip on earth is loosened that their grip on heaven may be tightened.

Moreover there is an instinctive hope in the human breast of something better in the future for man and society. It is this instinctive looking forward that made "Looking Backward" possible. There is another Eden before us. The golden age of the world is yet to come. It is no time for despair, but for faith, and for the recognition and vigorous use of the means for human advancement which God himself has provided in the gospel. This is the only remedy for our social ills; it contains the solution of the grave problems that are perplexing thoughtful minds, and furnishes the divine cure for all the moral diseases that afflict humanity, in the individual and in the mass.

1. The gospel furnishes the true rule of life in all relations. Apply the golden rule to business and to domestic affairs, and what changes would be brought about, what cessation of strife and painful friction, what universal peace and harmony!

2. The gospel supplies the very strongest motives to right action, viz., love to God. The enthusiasm of humanity is born of the enthusiasm of Divinity. Human brotherhood rests on the divine Fatherhood. He who loves God will love his brother also.

3. The gospel insists that every man must be changed in heart and nature. It makes a new society by making new men. It purifies and elevates the social state by purifying individual members. Its fundamental postulate is that life determines environment, not environment life. New men will make a new heaven and a new earth. There never was such a time to preach the doctrine of the new birth as this. The power of Christ regenerating and saving the soul is the hope of society and of the world. "And He that sat upon the throne said, Behold I make all things new."

ALBANY, N. Y.

DECISION OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY IN THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN'S CASE.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, Nov. 16, 1889.

AMERICAN Churchmen seldom comment on the affairs of other Churches unless the matter in question is such as to affect the interests of all Churches. For this reason the startling decision of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in which he asserted his legal power to try a bishop of his province in his archiepiscopal court, was received in this country with slight remark. The gravity of the decision and the serious consequences to which it might lead in the British and Colonial Churches were obvious enough. It was also very certain that it must ultimately, though indirectly, have a weighty influence on the course of affairs in the American Church. Primarily, however, it concerned the Church of England alone, and as the archbishop's decision was applauded by very different schools of English Churchmen, there appeared to be no good reason why Americans should discuss it.

Of late it has begun to be understood that the archbishop's judgment is by no means universally approved in England. It is said to be disapproved by some, possibly by most,

of his
again
been
benef
The c
more
the w
of th
fund
Chri
tion
To
is of
Chu
adop
will
any
devi
tion
cord
any
clud
it is
cou
met
tha
bish
pro
for
Ch
inc
cor
me
obs
ter
ber
to
co
gi
re
so

th
st
u
a
w
C
n

t
t
h
t
l
b
l

of his grace's suffragans, and formal protests against its validity and expediency have been extensively signed by dignitaries and beneficed clergy of the Church of England. The discussion which has thus arisen is of more than local importance. It includes the whole subject of the history and rights of the Episcopal order. It concerns the fundamental constitution of the Church of Christ, and demands the earnest consideration of all Catholic Churches.

To the American Church, this judgment is of indirect but grave importance. In this Church few things are clearer than that the adoption of some sort of provincial system will very soon be indispensable; but before any acceptable plan for its adoption can be devised, many prejudices and misconceptions must be cleared away. As history records the existence of no provincial system anywhere in the world which did not include metropolitans of one name or another, it is as certain as anything can be that in course of time American provinces will have metropolitans; and yet it is very safe to say that if the prerogative claimed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, as metropolitan of his province, could possibly become a precedent for American metropolitans, American Churchmen would prefer to do without provinces or metropolitans for a long while to come. If we are not mistaken, the judgment of the archbishop raises an additional obstacle to the adoption of a provincial system of any kind in the American Church, because it will suggest to bishops, as well as to clergy and laity, the possibility of future consequences to which they would never give their deliberate consent. For these reasons, therefore, we think it right to say something of this important matter.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DECISION.

The judgment of the archbishop affirms that he has the right, as metropolitan, to summon, to try, and to pronounce judgment upon any bishop of his province who may be accused of ecclesiastical offences. In other words, the archbishop claims to be *Judex Ordinarius* of his suffragans, and, in the matter of discipline, *episcopus episcoporum*.

The first observation we have to make is that this claim of the archbishop is unquestionably well founded. As a matter of law, he undoubtedly has that power. So far as the mediæval laws of the Church of England were not repealed or modified at the Reformation, those laws are still in force. The canonical and customary rights of metropolitans over their suffragans were neither repealed nor modified at that time; and

since it is indisputable that metropolitans, before the Reformation, both could and did exercise sole jurisdiction over their suffragans, it follows that their successors retain the same jurisdiction. From a legal point of view, therefore, the archbishop's judgment is unassailable.

At the same time it were much to be wished that the archbishop had felt free and seen fit to let his mediæval prerogative quietly pass away from him and his successors. By calling his suffragans to sit with him as a synodical body he would substantially, if not formally, have accepted the model of the Primitive Church, which the Church of England professes to follow, and his action would have been a precedent which would not hereafter be disregarded. Thus he would have removed from the Reformed Church of England an inherited and wrongful anomaly; for the power of an archbishop to sit as sole judge of his brethren, however legal it may be in England, is not a primitive power of metropolitans; it involves a fatal contradiction of the fundamental principles of Episcopal polity; it is a mere remnant of a mediæval system so tyrannously oppressive that the modern papacy was invented as a means of escape from its yoke. This is mere matter of well-known history.

METROPOLITANS, PRIMITIVE AND FEUDAL.

In the Primitive Church no metropolitan ever dreamed of exercising personal jurisdiction over his brethren. The jurisdiction of his province belonged, not to him, but to the episcopate of the province. The synod of the province alone was competent to try a bishop, and the metropolitan himself was as amenable to the jurisdiction of that synod as the humblest bishop who sat in it. The metropolitan was simply *primus inter pares*, chief among his equals, and that in the same sense, and no other, in which the Presiding Bishop of the American Church is chief among his episcopal brethren.

It came to pass too soon in the history of the Church that its episcopate became a prelacy. That misfortune did not happen in the days of persecution; but as soon as the Church became a power with which statesmen were obliged to reckon, the position of a bishop became an object of ambition. At the court of Byzantium bishops were favored courtiers, and the episcopate was too often sought as a safe and swift means of temporal promotion. At the West, when the barbarians had overrun the Roman empire and adopted Christianity, the bad example of the East was quickly followed.

The bishop was a baron; a metropolitan was the peer of princes. Feudal theories were applied to the polity of the Church; and as every feudal lord was subject to his over-lord, and might be summoned to appear for trial in his lord's court, so the baron-bishops were subjected to their princely metropolitan, and might be tried in his court. In complete defiance of the ancient canons, provincial synods ceased to be regularly held, and the jurisdiction, which of right belonged to synods, passed for the most part to metropolitans.

THE FALSE DECRETALS: RISE OF THE PAPACY.

This change of the ecclesiastical constitution was not immediate but gradual, and its consequences were not everywhere equally apparent. In England the evil was less than elsewhere; in Germany it was deplorable. In Germany the tyranny of the metropolitans became insupportable, and led to the most marvellous fraud which ever disgraced the Church of Christ. It seems now to be historically certain that the false decretals, on the faith of which the entire fabric of the modern papacy was built up, were invented, not at Rome, but by some obscure German bishop, in order to establish in the papacy a power to which appeals might be brought from the unjust judgments and other oppressions of metropolitans. The learning of the time was not critical, and the pretended dicta of fathers and councils, of which the false decretals were composed, soon became maxims of papal jurisprudence. In effect they were a logical application of the feudal system to the government of the Church, and recognized in the Pope a suzerain to whom all other lords of the Church owed supreme allegiance. Thus the Pope claimed the same rights over metropolitans which metropolitans claimed and exercised over their suffragans, and metropolitans soon found in the Pope a lord paramount to whose authority the proudest of them was compelled to bow. It is idle to suppose that an institution like that of the papacy can be brought into existence by mere fraud. There was need of the papacy in the middle ages, or it could never have come into existence; and nothing in those ages contributed more to that fatal necessity than the feudal and utterly uncatholic usurpations of metropolitans.

METROPOLITAN PREROGATIVE IN ENGLAND NO PRECEDENT FOR OTHER CHURCHES.

Henry VIII. made short work of the papal

authority in England; but Henry was nothing more than a sagacious and determined statesman. He was no reformer of the Church. When the Reformation came, nothing was changed that could be wisely let alone. The laws of the Church were not abolished at one fell swoop in the "root and branch" style of the Puritans. There was nothing at the time to call special attention to the powers of metropolitans, and accordingly they were let alone. Those powers, therefore, remained in law; and there was no longer even a pope to whom a bishop might appeal from an archbishop's judgment. It is a wonderful proof of the characteristic moderation and discretion of the Church of England that this anomaly has bred no discontent, has led to no confusion, has, in fact, been clean forgotten. It is an ecclesiastical anomaly nevertheless. It is utterly uncatholic. It is a mere remnant of ecclesiastical feudalism. Now that it has been revived and practically applied in an important case, the Church of England will doubtless deal with it in her usual moderate and sagacious way; but if it should stand forever as the law for England, it can never be a precedent elsewhere. In the American Church, at least, mediæval precedents of that kind never will and never can be followed. In such a matter, the only precedents by which the American Church can be bound, and the only precedents she can follow, are those of the Primitive Church of Christ.

AGNOSTICISM.

BY PROF. THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

(Continued from the November number, p. 100.)

So I declare, as plainly as I can, that I am unable to show cause why these transferable devils should not exist; nor can I deny that, not merely the whole Roman Church, but many Wacean "infidels" of no mean repute, do honestly and firmly believe that the activity of such-like demonic beings is in full swing in this year of grace 1889.

Nevertheless, as good Bishop Butler says, "probability is the guide of life," and it seems to me that this is just one of the cases in which the canon of credibility and testimony, which I have ventured to lay down, has full force. So that, with the most entire respect for many (by no means for all) of our witnesses for the truth of demonology, ancient and modern, I conceive their evidence on this particular matter to be ri-

diculou
clusion

After
that an
be ang
the Lo
total d
But, if
stories
picion
demon
ber be
primit
New
said, i
mony
"unsu

I a
enced
Gadar
with
tion
broug
gelica
enoug
my J
about
taugh
pleas
which
Near
condi
doub

In
had
quite
and
outli
some
coul
new
stud
my
effor
it lie
erati
depi
ster
SS.

* T
one f
and
except
"spit
An
Goeth
"Trust
them
one
coul
abun
other
Th
the
the
diffe

diculously insufficient to warrant their conclusion.*

After what has been said I do not think that any sensible man, unless he happen to be angry, will accuse me of "contradicting the Lord and his apostles" if I reiterate my total disbelief in the whole Gadarene story. But, if that story is discredited, all the other stories of demoniac possession fall under suspicion. And if the belief in demons and demoniac possession, which forms the somber background of the whole picture of primitive Christianity presented to us in the New Testament, is shaken, what is to be said, in any case, of the uncorroborated testimony of the Gospels with respect to the "unseen world"?

I am not aware that I have been influenced by any more bias in regard to the Gadarene story than I have been in dealing with other cases of like kind the investigation of which has interested me. I was brought up in the strictest school of evangelical orthodoxy; and, when I was old enough to think for myself, I started upon my journey of inquiry with little doubt about the general truth of what I had been taught; and with that feeling of the unpleasantness of being called an "infidel" which, we are told, is so right and proper. Near my journey's end, I find myself in a condition of something more than mere doubt about these matters.

In the course of other inquiries, I have had to do with fossil remains which looked quite plain at a distance, and became more and more indistinct as I tried to define their outline by close inspection. There was something there—something which, if I could win assurance about it, might mark a new epoch in the history of the earth; but, study as long as I might, certainty eluded my grasp. So has it been with me in my efforts to define the grand figure of Jesus as it lies in the primary strata of Christian literature. Is he the kindly, peaceful Christ depicted in the Catacombs? Or is he the stern judge who frowns above the altar of SS. Cosmas and Damianus? Or can he be

rightly represented in the bleeding ascetic, broken down by physical pain, of too many mediæval pictures? Are we to accept the Jesus of the second, or the Jesus of the fourth Gospel, as the true Jesus? What did he really say and do; and how much that is attributed to him in speech and action is the embroidery of the various parties into which his followers tended to split themselves within twenty years of his death, when even the threefold tradition was only nascent?

If any one will answer these questions for me with something more to the point than feeble talk about the "cowardice of agnosticism," I shall be deeply his debtor. Unless and until they are satisfactorily answered, I say of agnosticism in this matter, "*J'y suis, et j'y reste.*"

But, as we have seen, it is asserted that I have no business to call myself an agnostic; that if I am not a Christian I am an infidel; and that I ought to call myself by that name of "unpleasant significance." Well, I do not care much what I am called by other people, and, if I had at my side all those who since the Christian era have been called infidels by other folks, I could not desire better company. If these are my ancestors, I prefer, with the old Frank, to be with them wherever they are. But there are several points in Dr. Wace's contention which must be eliminated before I can even think of undertaking to carry out his wishes. I must, for instance, know what a Christian is. Now what is a Christian? By whose authority is the signification of that term defined? Is there any doubt that the immediate followers of Jesus, the "sect of the Nazarenes," were strictly orthodox Jews, differing from other Jews not more than the Sadducees, the Pharisees, and the Essenes differed from one another; in fact, only in the belief that the Messiah, for whom the rest of their nation waited, had come? Was not their chief, "James, the brother of the Lord," revered alike by Sadducee, Pharisee, and Nazarene? At the famous conference which, according to the Acts, took place at Jerusalem, does not James declare that "myriads" of Jews, who, by that time had become Nazarenes, were "all zealous for the law"? Was not the name of "Christian" first used to denote the converts to the doctrine promulgated by Paul and Barnabas at Antioch? Does the subsequent history of Christianity leave any doubt that, from this time forth, the "little rift within the lute," caused by the new teaching developed, if not inaugurated, at Antioch, grew wider and wider, until the two types of doctrine

* Their arguments, in the long run, are always reducible to one form. Otherwise trustworthy witnesses affirm that such and such events took place. These events are inexplicable, except the agency of "spirits" is admitted. Therefore "spirits" were the cause of the phenomena.

And the heads of the reply are always the same. Remember Goethe's aphorism: "*Alles factische ist schon Theorie.*" Trustworthy witnesses are constantly deceived, or deceive themselves, in their interpretation of sensible phenomena. No one can prove that the sensible phenomena, in these cases, could be caused only by the agency of spirits; and there is abundant ground for believing that they may be produced in other ways.

Therefore, the utmost that can be reasonably asked for, on the evidence as it stands, is suspension of judgment. And on the necessity for even that suspension, reasonable men may differ, according to their views of probability.

irreconcilably diverged? Did not the primitive Nazarenism or Ebionism develop into the Nazarenism, and Ebionism, and Elkasaitism of later ages, and finally die out in obscurity and condemnation as damnable heresy; while the younger doctrine thrived and pushed out its shoots into that endless variety of sects, of which the three strongest survivors are the Roman and Greek Churches and modern Protestantism?

Singular state of things! If I were to profess the doctrine which was held by "James, the brother of the Lord," and by every one of the "myriads" of his followers and co-religionists in Jerusalem up to twenty or thirty years after the crucifixion (and one knows not how much later at Pella), I should be condemned with unanimity as an ebionizing heretic by the Roman, Greek, and Protestant Churches! And, probably, this hearty and unanimous condemnation of the creed held by those who were in the closest personal relation with their Lord is almost the only point upon which they would be cordially of one mind. On the other hand—though I hardly dare imagine such a thing—I very much fear that the "pillars" of the primitive Hierosolymitan Church would have considered Dr. Wace an infidel. No one can read the famous second chapter of Galatians and the book of Revelation without seeing how narrow was even Paul's escape from a similar fate. And, if ecclesiastical history is to be trusted, the thirty-nine articles, be they right or wrong, diverge from the primitive doctrine of the Nazarenes vastly more than even Pauline Christianity did.

But, further than this, I have great difficulty in assuring myself that even James, "the brother of the Lord," and his "myriads" of Nazarenes, properly represented the doctrines of their Master. For it is constantly asserted by our modern "pillars" that one of the chief features of the work of Jesus was the instauration of religion by the abolition of what our sticklers for articles and liturgies, with unconscious humor, call the narrow restrictions of the law. Yet, if James knew this, how could the bitter controversy with Paul have arisen; and why did one or the other side not quote any of the various sayings of Jesus, recorded in the Gospels, which directly bear on the question—sometimes, apparently, in opposite directions?

So, if I am asked to call myself an "infidel," I reply, To what doctrine do you ask me to be faithful? Is it that contained in the Nicene and the Athanasian Creeds? My firm belief is that the Nazarenes, say of

the year 40, headed by James, would have stopped their ears and thought worthy of stoning the audacious man who propounded it to them. Is it contained in the so-called Apostles' Creed? I am pretty sure that even that would have created a recalcitrant commotion at Pella in the year 70, among the Nazarenes of Jerusalem, who had fled from the soldiers of Titus. And yet if the unadulterated tradition of the teachings of "the Nazarene" were to be found anywhere, it surely should have been amid those not very aged disciples who may have heard them as they were delivered.

Therefore, however sorry I may be to be unable to demonstrate that, if necessary, I should not be afraid to call myself an "infidel," I can not do it, even to gratify the Bishop of Peterborough and Dr. Wace. And I would appeal to the bishop, whose native sense of humor is not the least marked of his many excellent gifts and virtues, whether asking a man to call himself an "infidel" is not rather a droll request. "Infidel" is a term of reproach, which Christians and Mohammedans, in their modesty, agree to apply to those who differ from them. If he had only thought of it, Dr. Wace might have used the term "miscreant," which, with the same etymological signification, has the advantage of being still more "unpleasant" to the persons to whom it is applied. But, in the name of all that is Hibernian, I ask the Bishop of Peterborough why should a man be expected to call himself a "miscreant" or an "infidel"? That St. Patrick "had two birthdays because he was a twin" is a reasonable and intelligible utterance beside that of the man who should declare himself to be an infidel on the ground of denying his own belief. It may be logically, if not ethically, defensible, that a Christian should call a Mohammedan an infidel, and *vice versa*; but, on Dr. Wace's principles, both ought to call themselves infidels, because each applies that term to the other.

Now I am afraid that all the Mohammedan world would agree in reciprocating that appellation to Dr. Wace himself. I once visited the Hazar Mosque, the great university of Mohammedanism, in Cairo, in ignorance of the fact that I was unprovided with proper authority. A swarm of angry undergraduates, as I suppose I ought to call them, came buzzing about me and my guide; and, if I had known Arabic, I suspect that "dog of an infidel" would have been by no means the most "unpleasant" of the epithets showered upon me, before I could explain and apologize for the mistake.

If I ha
pany
follow
have
even
head
And I
one c
courte
anyth
of be
dered
to dis
From
suffic
the c
quite
that
woul
of fu
loath
more
will
than
Lo
self
terr
for
vices
omn
tor
splen
subj
of y
book
meta
this
my
Civi
Han
Unc
chan
burg
stra
poss
neve
and
con
and
tak
the
nur
suc
ble,
I
of
look

•
mat
Bam
kne

If I had had the pleasure of Dr. Wace's company on that occasion, the indiscriminate followers of the Prophet would, I am afraid, have made no difference between us; not even if they had known that he was the head of an orthodox Christian seminary. And I have not the smallest doubt that even one of the learned mollahs, if his grave courtesy would have permitted him to say anything offensive to men of another mode of belief, would have told us that he wondered we did not find it "very unpleasant" to disbelieve in the Prophet of Islam.

From what precedes, I think it becomes sufficiently clear that Dr. Wace's account of the origin of the name of "Agnostic" is quite wrong. Indeed, I am bound to add that very slight effort to discover the truth would have convinced him that, as a matter of fact, the term arose otherwise. I am loath to go over an old story once more; but more than one object which I have in view will be served by telling it a little more fully than it has yet been told.

Looking back nearly fifty years, I see myself as a boy, whose education had been interrupted, and who, intellectually, was left, for some years, altogether to his own devices. At that time I was a voracious and omnivorous reader; a dreamer and speculator of the first water, well endowed with that splendid courage in attacking any and every subject which is the blessed compensation of youth and inexperience. Among the books and essays, on all sorts of topics from metaphysics to heraldry, which I read at this time, two left indelible impressions on my mind. One was Guizot's "History of Civilization," the other was Sir William Hamilton's essay "On the Philosophy of the Unconditioned," which I came upon, by chance, in an odd volume of the "Edinburgh Review." The latter was certainly strange reading for a boy, and I could not possibly have understood a great deal of it; * nevertheless, I devoured it with avidity, and it stamped upon my mind the strong conviction that, on even the most solemn and important of questions, men are apt to take cunning phrases for answers; and that the limitation of our faculties, in a great number of cases, renders real answers to such questions not merely actually impossible, but theoretically inconceivable.

Philosophy and history having laid hold of me in this eccentric fashion, have never loosened their grip. I have no pretension

to be an expert in either subject; but the turn for philosophical and historical reading, which rendered Hamilton and Guizot attractive to me, has not only filled many lawful leisure hours, and still more sleepless ones, with the repose of changed mental occupation, but has not unfrequently disputed my proper work-time with my liege lady, Natural Science. In this way I have found it possible to cover a good deal of ground in the territory of philosophy; and all the more easily that I have never cared much about A's or B's opinions, but have rather sought to know what answer he had to give to the questions I had to put to him—that of the limitation of possible knowledge being the chief. The ordinary examiner, with his "State the views of So-and-so," would have floored me at any time. If he had said, "What do *you* think about any given problem?" I might have got on fairly well.

The reader who has had the patience to follow the enforced, but unwilling, egotism of this veritable history (especially if his studies have led him in the same direction), will now see why my mind steadily gravitated toward the conclusions of Hume and Kant, so well stated by the latter in a sentence, which I have quoted elsewhere:

"The greatest and perhaps the sole use of all philosophy of pure reason is, after all, merely negative, since it serves not as an organon for the enlargement [of knowledge], but as a discipline for its delimitation; and, instead of discovering truth, has only the modest merit of preventing error." *

When I reached intellectual maturity and began to ask myself whether I was an atheist, a theist, or a pantheist; a materialist or an idealist; a Christian or a free-thinker—I found that the more I learned and reflected, the less ready was the answer; until, at last, I came to the conclusion that I had neither art nor part with any of these denominations, except the last. The one thing in which most of these good people were agreed was the one thing in which I differed from them. They were quite sure they had attained a certain "gnosis"—had, more or less successfully, solved the problem of existence; while I was quite sure I had not, and had a pretty strong conviction that the problem was insoluble. And, with Hume and Kant on my side, I could not think myself presumptuous in holding fast by that opinion. Like Dante—

"Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita
Mi ritrovai per una selva oscura," †

* Yet I must somehow have laid hold of the pith of the matter, for many years afterward, when Dean Mansel's Bampton lectures were published it seemed to me I already knew all that this eminently agnostic thinker had to tell me.

* "Kritik der reinen Vernunft." Edit. Hartenstein, p. 256.

† [In the midway of this our mortal life
I found me in a gloomy wood astray.]

but, unlike Dante, I can not add—

"Che la diritta via era smarrita." *

On the contrary, I had, and have, the firmest conviction that I never left the "*verace via*"—the straight road; and that this road led nowhere else but into the dark depths of a wild and tangled forest. And though I have found leopards and lions in the path; though I have made abundant acquaintance with the hungry wolf, that with "privy paw devours apace and nothing said," as another great poet says of the ravening beast; and though no friendly specter has even yet offered his guidance, I was, and am, minded to go straight on, until I either come out on the other side of the wood, or find there is no other side to it—at least, none attainable by me.

This was my situation when I had the good fortune to find a place among the members of that remarkable confraternity of antagonists, long since deceased, but of green and pious memory, the Metaphysical Society. Every variety of philosophical and theological opinion was represented there, and expressed itself with entire openness; most of my colleagues were *ists* of one sort or another; and, however kind and friendly they might be, I, the man without a rag of a label to cover himself with, could not fail to have some of the uneasy feelings which must have beset the historical fox when, after leaving the trap in which his tail remained, he presented himself to his normally elongated companions. So I took thought, and invented what I conceived to be the appropriate title of "agnostic." It came into my head as suggestively antithetic to the "gnostic" of Church history, who professed to know so much about the very things of which I was ignorant; and I took the earliest opportunity of parading it at our society, to show that I, too, had a tail, like the other foxes. To my great satisfaction, the term took; and when the "Spectator" had stood godfather to it, any suspicion in the minds of respectable people, that a knowledge of its parentage might have awakened, was, of course, completely lulled.

That is the history of the origin of the terms "agnostic" and "agnosticism;" and it will be observed that it does not quite agree with the confident assertion of the reverend Principal of King's College, that "the adoption of the term agnostic is only an attempt to shift the issue, and that it involves a mere evasion" in relation to the Church and Christianity.†

The last objection (I rejoice, as much as my readers must do, that it is the last) which I have to take to Dr. Wace's deliverance before the Church Congress arises, I am sorry to say, on a question of morality.

"It is, and it ought to be," authoritatively declares this official representative of Christian ethics, "an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe in Jesus Christ" (*l. c.*, p. 254).

Whether it is so, depends, I imagine, a good deal on whether the man was brought up in a Christian household or not. I do not see why it should be "unpleasant" for a Mohammedan or a Buddhist to say so. But that "it ought to be" unpleasant for any man to say anything which he sincerely, and after due deliberation, believes, is, to my mind, a proposition of the most profoundly immoral character. I verily believe that the great good which has been effected in the world by Christianity has been largely counteracted by the pestilent doctrine on which all the churches have insisted, that honest disbelief in their more or less astonishing creeds is a moral offense, indeed a sin of the deepest dye, deserving and involving the same future retribution as murder and robbery. If we could only see, in one view, the torrents of hypocrisy and cruelty, the lies, the slaughter, the violations of every obligation of humanity, which have flowed from this source along the course of the history of Christian nations, our worst imaginations of hell would pale beside the vision.

A thousand times, no! It ought *not* to be unpleasant to say that which one honestly believes or disbelieves. That it so constantly is painful to do so, is quite enough obstacle to the progress of mankind in that most valuable of all qualities, honesty of word or of deed, without erecting a sad concomitant of human weakness into something to be admired and cherished. The bravest of soldiers often, and very naturally, "feel it unpleasant" to go into action; but a court-martial which did its duty would make short work of the officer who promulgated the doctrine that his men *ought* to feel their duty unpleasant.

I am very well aware, as I suppose most thoughtful people are in these times, that the process of breaking away from old beliefs is extremely unpleasant; and I am much disposed to think that the encouragement, the consolation, and the peace afforded to earnest believers in even the worst forms of Christianity are of great practical advantage to them. What deductions must be made from this gain on the score of the harm done to the citizen by the ascetic other-

* [Gone from the path direct.]

† Page 43.

worldliness of logical Christianity; to the ruler, by the hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness of sectarian bigotry; to the legislator, by the spirit of exclusiveness and domination of those that count themselves pillars of orthodoxy; to the philosopher, by the restraints on the freedom of learning and teaching which every church exercises, when it is strong enough; to the conscientious soul, by the introspective hunting after sins of the mint and cummin type, the fear of theological error, and the overpowering terror of possible damnation, which have accompanied the churches like their shadow, I need not now consider; but they are assuredly not small. If agnostics lose heavily on the one side, they gain a good deal on the other. People who talk about the comforts of belief appear to forget its discomforts; they ignore the fact that the Christianity of the churches is something more than faith in the ideal personality of Jesus, which they create for themselves, *plus* so much as can be carried into practice, without disorganizing civil society, of the maxims of the Sermon on the Mount. Trip in morals or in doctrine (especially in doctrine), without due repentance or retraction, or fail to get properly baptized before you die, and a *plébiscite* of the Christians of Europe, if they were true to their creeds, would affirm your everlasting damnation by an immense majority.

Preachers, orthodox and heterodox, din into our ears that the world can not get on without faith of some sort. There is a sense in which that is as eminently as obviously true; there is another, in which, in my judgment, it is as eminently as obviously false, and it seems to me that the hortatory, or pulpit, mind is apt to oscillate between the false and the true meanings, without being aware of the fact.

It is quite true that the ground of every one of our actions, and the validity of all our reasonings, rest upon the great act of faith, which leads us to take the experience of the past as a safe guide in our dealings with the present and the future. From the nature of ratiocination it is obvious that the axioms on which it is based can not be demonstrated by ratiocination. It is also a trite observation that, in the business of life, we constantly take the most serious action upon evidence of an utterly insufficient character. But it is surely plain that faith is not necessarily entitled to dispense with ratiocination because ratiocination can not dispense with faith as a starting-point; and that because we are often obliged, by the pressure of events, to act on very bad evidence, it does

not follow that it is proper to act on such evidence when the pressure is absent.

The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews tells us that "faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen." In the authorized version "substance" stands for "assurance," and "evidence" for "the proving." The question of the exact meaning of the two words, *ὑπόστασις* and *ἐλεγχος*, affords a fine field of discussion for the scholar and the metaphysician. But I fancy we shall be not far from the mark if we take the writer to have had in his mind the profound psychological truth that men constantly feel certain about things for which they strongly hope, but have no evidence, in the legal or logical sense of the word; and he calls this feeling "faith." I may have the most absolute faith that a friend has not committed the crime of which he is accused. In the early days of English history, if my friend could have obtained a few more compurgators of like robust faith, he would have been acquitted. At the present day, if I tendered myself as a witness on that score, the judge would tell me to stand down, and the youngest barrister would smile at my simplicity. Miserable indeed is the man who has not such faith in some of his fellow-men—only less miserable than the man who allows himself to forget that such faith is not, strictly speaking, evidence; and when his faith is disappointed, as will happen now and again, turns Timon and blames the universe for his own blunders. And so, if a man can find a friend, the hypostasis of all his hopes, the mirror of his ethical ideal, in the Jesus of any, or all, of the Gospels, let him live by faith in that ideal. Who shall or can forbid him? But let him not delude himself with the notion that his faith is evidence of the objective reality of that in which he trusts. Such evidence is to be obtained only by the use of the methods of science, as applied to history and to literature, and it amounts at present to very little.

It appears that Mr. Gladstone, some time ago, asked Mr. Laing if he could draw up a short summary of the negative creed; a body of negative propositions, which have so far been adopted on the negative side as to be what the Apostles' and other accepted creeds are on the positive; and Mr. Laing at once kindly obliged Mr. Gladstone with the desired articles—eight of them.

If any one had preferred this request to me, I should have replied that, if he referred to agnostics, they have no creed; and, by the nature of the case, can not have any.

Agnosticism, in fact, is not a creed, but a method, the essence of which lies in the rigorous application of a single principle. That principle is of great antiquity; it is as old as Socrates; as old as the writer who said, "Try all things, hold fast by that which is good"; it is the foundation of the Reformation, which simply illustrated the axiom that every man should be able to give a reason for the faith that is in him; it is the great principle of Descartes; it is the fundamental axiom of modern science. Positively the principle may be expressed: In matters of the intellect, follow your reason as far as it will take you, without regard to any other consideration. And negatively: In matters of the intellect, do not pretend that conclusions are certain which are not demonstrated or demonstrable. That I take to be the agnostic faith, which if a man keep whole and undefiled, he shall not be ashamed to look the universe in the face, whatever the future may have in store for him.

The results of the working out of the agnostic principle will vary according to individual knowledge and capacity, and according to the general condition of science. That which is unproved to-day may be proved, by the help of new discoveries, to-morrow. The only negative fixed points will be those negations which flow from the demonstrable limitation of our faculties. And the only obligation accepted is to have the mind always open to conviction. Agnostics who never fail in carrying out their principles are, I am afraid, as rare as other people of whom the same consistency can be truthfully predicated. But, if you were to meet with such a phoenix and to tell him that you had discovered that two and two make five, he would patiently ask you to state your reasons for that conviction, and express his readiness to agree with you if he found them satisfactory. The apostolic injunction to "suffer fools gladly," should be the rule of life of a true agnostic. I am deeply conscious how far I myself fall short of this ideal, but it is my personal conception of what agnostics ought to be.

However, as I began by stating, I speak only for myself; and I do not dream of anathematizing and excommunicating Mr. Laing. But, when I consider his creed and compare it with the Athanasian, I think I have, on the whole, a clearer conception of the meaning of the latter. "Polarity," in Article viii, for example, is a word about which I heard a good deal in my youth, when "Naturphilosophie" was in fashion, and greatly did I suffer from it. For many

years past, whenever I have met with "polarity" anywhere but in a discussion of some purely physical topic, such as magnetism, I have shut the book. Mr. Laing must excuse me if the force of habit was too much for me when I read his eighth article.

And now, what is to be said to Mr. Harrison's remarkable deliverance "On the future of agnosticism"?* I would that it were not my business to say anything, for I am afraid that I can say nothing which shall manifest my great personal respect for this able writer, and for the zeal and energy with which he ever and anon galvanizes the weakly frame of positivism until it looks more than ever like John Bunyan's Pope and Pagan rolled into one. There is a story often repeated, and I am afraid none the less mythical on that account, of a valiant and loud-voiced corporal, in command of two full privates, who, falling in with a regiment of the enemy in the dark, orders it to surrender under pain of instant annihilation by his force; and the enemy surrenders accordingly. I am always reminded of this tale when I read the positivist commands to the forces of Christianity and of Science; only the enemy show no more signs of intending to obey now than they have done any time these forty years.

The allocution under consideration has the papal flavor which is wont to hang about the utterances of the pontiffs of the Church of Comte. Mr. Harrison speaks with authority, and not as one of the common scribes of the period. He knows not only what agnosticism is and how it has come about, but what will become of it. The agnostic is to content himself with being the precursor of the positivist. In his place, as a sort of navvy leveling the ground and cleansing it of such poor stuff as Christianity, he is a useful creature who deserves patting on the back, on condition that he does not venture beyond his last. But let not these scientific Sanballats presume that they are good enough to take part in the building of the temple—they are mere Samaritans, doomed to die out in proportion as the Religion of Humanity is accepted by mankind. Well, if that is their fate, they have time to be cheerful. But let us hear Mr. Harrison's pronouncement of their doom:

"Agnosticism is a stage in the evolution of religion, an entirely negative stage, the point reached by physicists, a purely mental conclusion, with no relation to things social at all" (p. 154). I am quite dazed

* "Fortnightly Review," January, 1889.

by this
"concl
tal"?
cial" i
men's v
prince
larly in
posing
would
the phi
actly t
more o
ment a
Rome,
poems,
and in
nostici
sleist?"

"A
of reli
what i
if it n
simply
ideal,
life, w
say ag
than i
If, on
most
then,
said
death
the e

Wh
of tho
have s

I c
this,
proce
he r
have
he ki
wher
thing
mean
bein
show
the
disti
may

Ag
on a
evolu

B
nost
leas
so f
and
the
rest

by this declaration. Are there, then, any "conclusions" that are not "purely mental"? Is there "no relation to things social" in "mental conclusions" which affect men's whole conception of life? Was that prince of agnostics, David Hume, particularly imbued with physical science? Supposing physical science to be non-existent, would not the agnostic principle, applied by the philologist and the historian, lead to exactly the same results? Is the modern more or less complete suspension of judgment as to the facts of the history of regal Rome, or the real origin of the Homeric poems, anything but agnosticism in history and in literature? And if so, how can agnosticism be the "mere negation of the physicist"?

"Agnosticism is a stage in the evolution of religion." No two people agree as to what is meant by the term "religion"; but if it means, as I think it ought to mean, simply the reverence and love for the ethical ideal, and the desire to realize that ideal in life, which every man ought to feel—then I say agnosticism has no more to do with it than it has to do with music or painting. If, on the other hand, Mr. Harrison, like most people, means by "religion" theology, then, in my judgment, agnosticism can be said to be a stage in its evolution, only as death may be said to be the final stage in the evolution of life.

When agnostic logic is simply one of the canons of thought, agnosticism, as a distinctive faith, will have spontaneously disappeared (p. 155).

I can but marvel that such sentences as this, and those already quoted, should have proceeded from Mr. Harrison's pen. Does he really mean to suggest that agnostics have a logic peculiar to themselves? Will he kindly help me out of my bewilderment when I try to think of "logic" being anything else than the canon (which, I believe, means rule) of thought? As to agnosticism being a distinctive faith, I have already shown that it cannot possibly be anything of the kind; unless perfect faith in logic is distinctive of agnostics, which, after all, it may be.

Agnosticism as a religious philosophy *per se* rests on an almost total ignoring of history and social evolution (p. 152).

But neither *per se* nor *per aliud* has agnosticism (if I know anything about it) the least pretension to be a religious philosophy; so far from resting on ignorance of history, and that social evolution of which history is the account, it is and has been the inevitable result of the strict adherence to scientific

methods by historical investigators. Our forefathers were quite confident about the existence of Romulus and Remus, of King Arthur, and of Hengist and Horsa. Most of us have become agnostics in regard to the reality of these worthies. It is a matter of notoriety, of which Mr. Harrison, who accuses us all so freely of ignoring history, should not be ignorant, that the critical process which has shattered the foundations of orthodox Christian doctrine owes its origin, not to the devotees of physical science, but, before all, to Richard Simon, the learned French Oratorian, just two hundred years ago. I cannot find evidence that either Simon, or any one of the great scholars and critics of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries who have continued Simon's work, had any particular acquaintance with physical science. I have already pointed out that Hume was independent of it. And certainly one of the most potent influences in the same direction, upon history in the present century, that of Grote, did not come from the physical side. Physical science, in fact, has had nothing directly to do with the criticism of the Gospels; it is wholly incompetent to furnish demonstrative evidence that any statement made in these histories is untrue. Indeed, modern physiology can find parallels in nature for events of apparently the most eminently supernatural kind recounted in some of those histories.

It is a comfort to hear, upon Mr. Harrison's authority, that the laws of physical nature show no signs of becoming "less definite, less consistent, or less popular as time goes on" (p. 154). How a law of nature is to become indefinite, or "inconsistent," passes my poor powers of imagination. But with universal suffrage and the coach-dog theory of premiership in full view; the theory, I mean, that the whole duty of a political chief is to look sharp for the way the social coach is driving, and then run in front and bark loud—as if being the leading noisemaker and guiding were the same things—it is truly satisfactory to me to know that the laws of nature are increasing in popularity. Looking at recent developments of the policy which is said to express the great heart of the people, I have had my doubts of the fact; and my love for my fellow-countrymen has led me to reflect with dread on what will happen to them, if any of the laws of nature ever become so unpopular in their eyes as to be voted down by the transcendent authority of universal suffrage. If the legion of demons, before they set out on their journey in the swine, had had time to hold a meeting and to resolve unani-

mously, "That the law of gravitation is oppressive and ought to be repealed," I am afraid it would have made no sort of difference to the result, when their two thousand unwilling porters were once launched down the steep slopes of the fatal shore of Genesaret.

The question of the place of religion as an element of human nature, as a force of human society, its origin, analysis, and functions, has never been considered at all from an agnostic point of view (p. 152).

I doubt not that Mr. Harrison knows vastly more about history than I do; in fact, he tells the public that some of my friends and I have had no opportunity of occupying ourselves with that subject. I do not like to contradict any statement which Mr. Harrison makes on his own authority; only, if I may be true to my agnostic principles, I humbly ask how he has obtained assurance on this head. I do not profess to know anything about the range of Mr. Harrison's studies; but as he has thought it fitting to start the subject, I may venture to point out that, on the evidence adduced, it might be equally permissible to draw the conclusion that Mr. Harrison's absorbing labors as the *pontifex maximus* of the positivist religion have not allowed him to acquire that acquaintance with the methods and results of physical science, or with the history of philosophy, or of philological and historical criticism, which is essential to any one who desires to obtain a right understanding of agnosticism. Incompetence in philosophy, and in all branches of science except mathematics, is the well-known mental characteristic of the founder of Positivism. Faithfulness in disciples is an admirable quality in itself; the pity is that it not unfrequently leads to the imitation of the weaknesses as well as of the strength of the master. It is only such over-faithfulness which can account for a "strong mind really saturated with the historical sense" (p. 153) exhibiting the extraordinary forgetfulness of the historical fact of the existence of David Hume implied by the assertion that

it would be difficult to name a single known agnostic who has given to history anything like the amount of thought and study which he brings to a knowledge of the physical world (p. 153).

Whoso calls to mind, what I may venture to term, the bright side of Christianity; that ideal of manhood, with its strength and its patience; its justice and its pity for human frailty; its helpfulness, to the extremity of self-sacrifice; its ethical purity and nobility; which apostles have pictured, in which armies of martyrs have placed their

unshakable faith, and whence obscure men and women, like Catherine of Sienna and John Knox, have derived the courage to rebuke popes and kings, is not likely to under-rate the importance of the Christian faith as a factor in human history, or to doubt that if that faith should prove to be incompatible with our knowledge, or necessary want of knowledge, some other hypostasis of men's hopes, genuine enough and worthy enough to replace it, will arise. But that the incongruous mixture of bad science with eviscerated papistry, out of which Comte manufactured the positivist religion, will be the heir of the Christian ages, I have too much respect for the humanity of the future to believe. Charles II. told his brother, "They will not kill me, James, to make you king." And if critical science is remorselessly destroying the historical foundations of the noblest ideal of humanity which mankind have yet worshipped, it is little likely to permit the pitiful reality to climb into the vacant shrine.

That a man should determine to devote himself to the service of humanity—including intellectual and moral self-culture under that name; that this should be, in the proper sense of the word, his religion—is not only an intelligible, but, I think, a laudable resolution. And I am greatly disposed to believe that it is the only religion which will prove itself to be unassailably acceptable so long as the human race endures. But when the positivist asks me to worship "Humanity"—that is to say, to adore the generalized conception of men as they ever have been and probably ever will be—I must reply that I could just as soon bow down and worship the generalized conception of a "wilderness of apes." Surely we are not going back to the days of paganism, when individual men were deified, and the hard good sense of a dying Vespasian could prompt the bitter jest, "*Ut puto Deus fio.*" No divinity doth hedge a modern man, be he even a sovereign ruler. Nor is there any one, except a municipal magistrate, who is officially declared worshipful. But if there is no spark of worship-worthy divinity in the individual twigs of humanity, whence comes that god-like splendor which the Moses of positivism fondly imagines to pervade the whole bush?

I know no study which is so unutterably saddening as that of the evolution of humanity, as it is set forth in the annals of history. Out of the darkness of prehistoric ages man emerges with the marks of his lowly origin strong upon him. He is a brute, only more intelligent than the other brutes; a blind prey to impulses, which as often as not lead

him to
sions,
terror
with
certain
velopa
in suc
Mesop
thousa
with v
wicke
tain h
and t
make
secuti
to mo
step,
tion o
proces
yet fa
epoch
est bl

The
forgi
men
indis
and c
truth
the
ness
of h
any
Emp
comp
anth

W
twen
teen
this
T
in t
tury
sect
the
the
rec
imp

gre
tive
as i
kno
its
less
of
of
of
cou
we
do

him to destruction ; a victim to endless illusions, which make his mental existence a terror and a burden, and fill his physical life with barren toil and battle. He attains a certain degree of physical comfort, and develops a more or less workable theory of life, in such favorable situations as the plains of Mesopotamia or of Egypt, and then, for thousands and thousands of years, struggles with varying fortunes, attended by infinite wickedness, bloodshed, and misery, to maintain himself at this point against the greed and the ambition of his fellow-men. He makes a point of killing and otherwise persecuting all those who first try to get him to move on ; and when he has moved on a step, foolishly confers *post-mortem* deification on his victims. He exactly repeats the process with all who want to move a step yet farther. And the best men of the best epochs are simply those who make the fewest blunders and commit the fewest sins.

That one should rejoice in the good man ; forgive the bad man ; and pity and help all men to the best of one's ability, is surely indisputable. It is the glory of Judaism and of Christianity to have proclaimed this truth, through all their aberrations. But the worship of a God who needs forgiveness and help, and deserves pity every hour of his existence, is no better than that of any other voluntarily selected fetich. The Emperor Julian's project was hopeful, in comparison with the prospects of the new anthropolatry.

When the historian of religion in the twentieth century is writing about the nineteenth, I foresee he will say something of this kind :

The most curious and instructive events in the religious history of the preceding century are the rise and progress of two new sects, called Mormons and Positivists. To the student who has carefully considered these remarkable phenomena nothing in the records of religious self-delusion can appear improbable.

The Mormons arose in the midst of the great Republic, which, though comparatively insignificant at that time, in territory as in the number of its citizens, was (as we know from the fragments of the speeches of its orators which have come down to us) no less remarkable for the native intelligence of its population, than for the wide extent of their information, owing to the activity of their publishers in diffusing all that they could invent, beg, borrow, or steal. Nor were they less noted for their perfect freedom from all restraints in thought or speech

or deed ; except, to be sure, the beneficent and wise influence of the majority exerted, in case of need, through an institution known as "tarring and feathering," the exact nature of which is now disputed.

There is a complete consensus of testimony that the founder of Mormonism, one Joseph Smith, was a low-minded, ignorant scamp, and that he stole the "Scriptures" which he propounded ; not being clever enough to forge even such contemptible stuff as they contain. Nevertheless he must have been a man of some force of character, for a considerable number of disciples soon gathered about him. In spite of repeated outbursts of popular hatred and violence—during one of which persecutions, Smith was brutally murdered—the Mormon body steadily increased, and became a flourishing community. But the Mormon practices being objectionable to the majority, they were, more than once, without any pretence of law, but by force of riot, arson, and murder, driven away from the land they had occupied. Harried by these persecutions, the Mormon body eventually committed itself to the tender mercies of a desert as barren as that of Sinai ; and, after terrible sufferings and privations, reached the oasis of Utah. Here it grew and flourished, sending out missionaries to, and receiving converts from, all parts of Europe, sometimes to the number of 10,000 in a year ; until in 1880, the rich and flourishing community numbered 110,000 souls in Utah alone, while there were probably 30,000 or 40,000 scattered abroad elsewhere. In the whole history of religions there is no more remarkable example of the power of faith ; and, in this case, the founder of that faith was indubitably a most despicable creature. It is interesting to observe that the course taken by the great Republic and its citizens runs exactly parallel with that taken by the Roman Empire and its citizens toward the early Christians, except that the Romans had a certain legal excuse for their acts of violence, inasmuch as the Christian "sodalitia" were not licensed, and consequently were, *ipso facto*, illegal assemblages. Until, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the United States Legislature decreed the illegality of polygamy, the Mormons were wholly within the law.

Nothing can present a greater contrast to all this than the history of the Positivists. This sect arose much about the same time as that of the Mormons, in the upper and most instructed stratum of the quick-witted, sceptical population of Paris. The founder, Auguste Comte, was a teacher of mathemat-

ies, but of no eminence in that department of knowledge, and with nothing but an amateur's acquaintance with physical, chemical, and biological science. His works are repulsive on account of the dull diffuseness of their style, and a certain air, as of a superior person, which characterizes them; but, nevertheless, they contain good things here and there. It would take too much space to reproduce in detail a system which proposes to regulate all human life by the promulgation of a gentile Leviticus. Suffice it to say that M. Comte may be described as a syncretic, who, like the gnostics of early Church history, attempted to combine the substance of imperfectly comprehended contemporary science with the form of Roman Christianity. It may be that this is the reason why his disciples were so very angry with some obscure people called Agnostics, whose views, if we may judge by the accounts left in the works of a great positivist controversial writer, were very absurd.

To put the matter briefly, M. Comte, finding Christianity and Science at daggers drawn, seems to have said to Science: "You find Christianity rotten at the core, do you? Well, I will scoop out the inside of it." And to Romanism: "You find Science mere dry light—cold and bare. Well, I will put your shell over it, and so, as schoolboys make a spectre out of a turnip and a tallow candle, behold the new religion of Humanity complete!"

Unfortunately, neither the Romanists nor the people who were something more than amateurs in science could be got to worship M. Comte's new idol properly. In the native country of Positivism, one distinguished man of letters and one of science, for a time, helped to make up a roomful of the faithful, but their love soon grew cold. In England, on the other hand, there appears to be little doubt that, in the ninth decade of the century, the multitude of disciples reached the grand total of several score. They had the advantage of the advocacy of one or two most eloquent and learned apostles, and, at any rate, the sympathy of several persons of light and leading—and, if they were not seen, they were heard all over the world. On the other hand, as a sect, they labored under the prodigious disadvantage of being refined, estimable people, living in the midst of the worn-out civilization of the Old World, where any one who had tried to persecute them, as the Mormons were persecuted, would have been instantly hanged. But the majority never dreamed of persecuting them; on the contrary, they were

rather given to scold, and otherwise try the patience of the majority.

The history of these sects in the closing years of the century is highly instructive. Mormonism. . . .

But I find I have suddenly slipped off Mr. Harrison's tripod, which I had borrowed for the occasion. The fact is, I am not equal to the prophetic business, and ought not to have undertaken it.

III.

AGNOSTICISM.

A REPLY TO PROFESSOR HUXLEY.

BY HENRY WACE, D.D.

It would hardly be reasonable to complain of Professor Huxley's delay in replying to the paper on "Agnosticism" which I read five months ago, when, at the urgent request of an old friend, I reluctantly consented to address the Church Congress at Manchester. I am obliged to him for doing it the honor to bring it to the notice of a wider circle than that to which it was directly addressed; and I fear that, for reasons which have been the occasion of universal regret, he may not have been equal to literary effort. But, at the same time, it is impossible not to notice that a writer is at a great advantage in attacking a fugitive essay a quarter of a year after it was made public. Such a lapse of time ought, indeed, to enable him to apprehend distinctly the argument with which he is dealing; and it might, at least, secure him from any such inaccuracy in quotation as greater haste might excuse. But if either his idiosyncrasy, or his sense of assured superiority, should lead him to pay no real attention to the argument he is attacking, or should betray him into material misquotation, he may at least be sure that scarcely any of his readers will care to refer to the original paper, or will have the opportunity of doing so. I can scarcely hope that Professor Huxley's obliging reference to the "Official Report of the Church Congress" will induce many of those who are influenced by his answer to my paper to purchase that interesting volume, though they would be well repaid by some of its other contents; and I can hardly rely on their spending even twopence upon the reprint of the paper, published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

I have
tor of
mit to
positi
sailed,
is pra
space
not, i
colleg
chairm
and o
would
with
Bet i
to my
and
which
and
elabor
is no
ley's
paper
of th
more
tion
ities
W
Prof
enou
scrip
pass
comm
of an
is in
and
But
from
that
Jesu
and
an a
a sel
or o
plea
sum
kno
The
beli
Jesu
teri
in
anc
Hu
Cin
abo
was
acc
olo
ind
poi

I have therefore felt obliged to ask the editor of this review to be kind enough to admit to his pages a brief restatement of the position which Professor Huxley has assailed, with such notice of his arguments as is practicable within the comparatively brief space which can be afforded me. I could not, indeed, amid the pressing claims of a college like this in term time, besides the chairmanship of a hospital, a preachership, and other duties, attempt any reply which would deal as thoroughly as could be wished with an article of so much skill and finish. But it is a matter of justice to my cause and to myself to remove at once the unscientific and prejudiced representation of the case which Professor Huxley has put forward; and fortunately there will be need of no elaborate argument for this purpose. There is no occasion to go beyond Professor Huxley's own article and the language of my paper to exhibit his entire misapprehension of the point in dispute; while I am much more than content to rely for the invalidation of his own contentions upon the authorities he himself quotes.

What, then, is the position with which Professor Huxley finds fault? He is good enough to say that what he calls my "description" of an agnostic may for the present pass, so that we are so far, at starting, on common ground. The actual description of an agnostic, which is given in my paper, is indeed distinct from the words he quotes, and is taken from an authoritative source. But what I have said is that, as an escape from such an article of Christian belief as that we have a Father in heaven, or that Jesus Christ is the Judge of quick and dead, and will hereafter return to judge the world, an agnostic urges that "he has no means of a scientific knowledge of the unseen world or of the future;" and I maintain that this plea is irrelevant. Christians do not presume to say that they have a scientific knowledge of such articles of their creed. They say that they believe them, and they believe them mainly on the assurances of Jesus Christ. Consequently their characteristic difference from an agnostic consists in the fact that they believe those assurances, and that he does not. Professor Huxley's observation, "Are there then any Christians who say that they know nothing about the unseen world and the future? I was ignorant of the fact, but I am ready to accept it on the authority of a professed theologian," is either a quibble, or one of many indications that he does not recognize the point at issue. I am speaking, as the sen-

tence shows, of scientific knowledge—knowledge which can be obtained by our own reason and observation alone—and no one with Professor Huxley's learning is justified in being ignorant that it is not upon such knowledge, but upon supernatural revelation, that Christian belief rests. However, as he goes on to say, my view of "the real state of the case is that the agnostic 'does not believe the authority' on which 'these things' are stated, which authority is Jesus Christ. He is simply an old-fashioned 'infidel' who is afraid to own to his right name." The argument has nothing to do with his motive, whether it is being afraid or not. It only concerns the fact that that by which he is distinctively separated from the Christian is that he does not believe the assurances of Jesus Christ.

Professor Huxley thinks there is "an attractive simplicity about this solution of the problem"—he means, of course, this statement of the case—"and it has that advantage of being somewhat offensive to the persons attacked, which is so dear to the less refined sort of controversialist." I think Professor Huxley must have forgotten himself and his own feelings in this observation. There can be no question, of course, of his belonging himself to the more refined sort of controversialist; but he has a characteristic fancy for solutions of problems, or statements of cases, which have the "advantage of being somewhat offensive to the persons attacked." Without taking this particular phrase into account, it certainly has "the advantage of being offensive to the persons attacked" that Professor Huxley should speak in this article of "the pestilent doctrine on which all the churches have insisted, the honest disbelief"—the word honest is not a misquotation—"honest disbelief in their more or less astonishing creeds is a moral offence, indeed a sin of the deepest dye, deserving and involving the same future retribution as murder or robbery," or that he should say, "Trip in morals or in doctrine (especially in doctrine), without due repentance or retraction, or fail to get properly baptized before you die, and a *plébiscite* of the Christians of Europe, if they were true to their creeds, would affirm your everlasting damnation by an immense majority." We have fortunately nothing to do in this argument with *plébiscites*; and as statements of authoritative Christian teaching, the least that can be said of these allegations is that they are offensive exaggerations.

(To be continued.)

GOODLY WORDS.

Original translations from MEISTER ECKHART, by C. H. A. Bjerregaard, Librarian, the Astor Library.

(Martensen, page xvii.)* When I speak, I am accustomed to speak about (1) abandonment of the world, and that man is to be liberated from self and the things of the world; (2) how we ought to be conformed to the Simple Good, which is God; (3) that one ought to consider the nobility of the soul, given by God; (4) about the unspeakable purity and clearness of the Divine nature.

(Mart. xvii.) What is Eternity? Eternity is an ever-present now, which knows nothing of time. The day passed a thousand years ago is no further from Eternity than this present hour; and the day which is to come in a thousand years is no further from Eternity than this hour in which I am preaching.

(Mart. xvii.) Everything rests only in its spring. If you throw a stone up into the air it rests not, it falls again to the ground. Why so? The ground is its resting-place, it is not at home in the air. The spring from which I am come forth is the Deity. The Deity is my native country. Have I my father in the Deity? Yea, not only my father have I there, but myself too. Before I existed (before I became I), I rested in the Deity.

(Mart. xviii.) The nearer a thing is to its spring, the younger it is. The farther it is from its spring, the older it is. The nearer the soul is to God, the younger she is. In reasonableness one is always young, and the more truly one stands in reasonableness, the nearer one is to the spring. That which I am according to time, that perishes in time, and goes to nought; but according to my birth, which is eternal, I shall never die. Know this: the child in the womb is old enough to die, but I will mourn if I am not younger to-morrow than I am to-day.

(Mart. xviii.) In the fullness of time God sends His Son in the soul. What is the fullness of time? It is come when time is no more. He who, still being in time, has set his heart in eternity, in him is the fullness of time. When the soul is liberated from time and space, then God sends His Son in the soul.

(Mart. xix.) None is good, but One, God. What is Good? That which is most universal and communicates itself to everything else. He is a good man who is useful and has something to communicate to others. God is the most universal of all beings: He communicates Himself to all things. No thing gives itself. The Sun gives its light only, but remains in itself as before. But God gives Himself in all His gifts. If He did not give Himself He would not be God.

In all things something of God is to be found, but in the soul God is personally present.

(Mart. xix.) If you seek God for His sake alone, then you shall find Him and the whole world besides.

(Mart. xix.) Plain people often believe that they ought to think of God as if He stood here or there. It is not so. God and I are one in Understanding. God's essence is Understanding, and God's Understanding makes me know Him. Therefore is His Understanding my Understanding.

(Mart. xx.) Every going out is for the sake of the going in. Every Beginning is for the sake of the End. God does not rest where He is only a

Beginning, but where He is the End of all being. (Not as if these beings were annihilated; they are perfected.)

What is the last End? It is the hidden darkness of the eternal Godhead. It is unknown and is never to be known.

(Mart. xx.) Do you ask me to tell you what God intended when He created all things? I answer: Rest! Again, do you ask me what all creation longs for according to its nature? I answer: Rest! Again, do you ask me what the soul is seeking? I answer: Rest! . . . In the pure soul God finds Rest, and that soul rests in God. In the same degree as God rests in the soul, that soul rests in God. If the soul rests but partially in God, God rests but partially in it. If you refuse to let God rest in your soul, you rob Him of His Godhead.

(Mart. xx.) God begins where Nature ends. God asks no more of you than that you go out of yourself, that God may be God in you. The least created image that possesses your soul becomes as large as God. Why? It robs you of an entire God. When the image enters, God must give way. When the image makes its exit, God enters anew. So much does God love your salvation that His own blessedness is dependent upon it, as it were. Oh man! can it hurt you that you allow God to be God in you?

(Mart. xx.) People often say to me: "Pray God for me." Then I think with myself: "Why go ye out? Why abide ye not in your own selves, and lay hold on the good in your own possession? Ye have all truth essentially within you."

(Mart. xxi.) All the creature longs to become like unto God. If God were not in all things, Nature would know of neither activity nor longing. Nature longs secretly for God. Consciously or unconsciously, for or against, Nature turns to God alone in all her endeavors. If a man were ever so thirsty, he could not desire a drink if something of God were not in it.

(Mart. xxi.) God loves Nothing but Himself; He consumes all His love in Himself. No one needs be alarmed because I said that God loves Himself only. It is the very best for us, and our salvation depends upon it.

(Mart. xxi.) God loves Himself, His nature, His being, and His Godhead. With the same love as God loves Himself, He loves all the creature, but not as the creature, but as the creature like God. Now, I ask you to listen; I will speak as I never spoke before: God tastes Himself, and as He tastes Himself He tastes all the creature, not as the creature, but as the creature like God.

(Mart. xxi.) My outer man tastes all the created things as created things—wine as wine, bread as bread. My inner man tastes everything as the gift of God. But in all gifts God gives Himself.

(Mart. xxii.) It is an undoubted truth that it is necessary for God to seek us; yea, His Godhead depends upon it. God can no more be without us than we without Him. If we should turn from God, He could not turn from us. Therefore I will not ask Him for anything, nor will I thank Him for anything He has already given me; but I will ask that He will make me worthy to receive Him, and I will praise Him, because His nature is so that He must give good gifts.

(Mart. xxii.) By Truth, The Good, Eternal, and Everlasting, I declare that to every man who hath utterly abandoned self, God communicates Himself according to all His power, so entirely that He retains nothing in His life and in His essence, in His nature and in His Godhead; He must pour Himself out in a fruitful (fruit-bearing) way.

* The translations are made from the texts given in (Prof. Theol.) Dr. H. Martensen's *Meister Eckhart*. Eine theologische Studie, Hamburg, 1842. Now out of print and scarce. All translations have been compared with the author's original Danish work and the later text editions of Eckhart.

PARAGRAPHIC.

THERE are more Jews in New York City than there are in Jerusalem, the number being about 90,000.

A HEBREW Bible in the Vatican is said to be the most valuable book in the world. It weighs more than 320 pounds, and its weight in gold, or \$125,000, has been refused for it, when gold was worth three times what it is now. This was in the days of Pope Julius or in 1512.

THE *Christian at Work* says :
"There are those who spell denominationalism with a big D and Gospel with a little g."

THERE is unspeakable significance in the words of the aged and wicked man who said : "I am not afraid to die, but *I am afraid to be dead.*"—*Zion's Herald.*

FORCE OF HABIT.—Clerical-looking personage enters the restaurant.

Waiter : "What will you have, sir?"

Rev. : "Steak, please."

Waiter : "How will you have it?"

Rev., absent-mindedly : "Well done, thou good and faithful—ahem!"—*From Lippincott's.*

THE *Congregationalist* says : "It is not essential to the highest success that a man should always have a crowd to hear him. The deeper question is, What impression does the preacher make on those who do hear him? Do his words influence their thought and conduct? Do they produce character? It may be that the man who carries his hearers with him, even if they are few, accomplishes more in the course of years than the man who always speaks to a crowd."

WE learn on the authority of the Hon. John Jay, that "Webster denounced the 'infidel argument' that the great religious truths believed by all Christians, the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the divine authority of the New Testament could not be taught without sectarianism," and President Dwight of the Columbia College Law School says, that it was "well settled by the decisions of the leading States of the Union that Christianity is a part of the common law of the State."

It was at the last session of the Southern Illinois Conference. Recommendations for local deacons and elders' orders were under consideration, and the bishop put the question to a candidate whose case was under consideration : "Will you *wholly* abstain from the use of tobacco?" There was a moment's hesitation, which gained the attention of the conference, when the answer came : "Bishop, I don't use it for smoking or for chewing, but—but—I want to continue the use of it for *horse medicine.*" For a few moments the laughter was irrepressible.—*Central Christian Advocate.*

LABORER AND LOAFER.—Home returneth the good pastor from an earned vacation in Europe, joyously greeting his native land. To him the elder, far better than the pastor, comes with fervent greeting for his welcome home. Shaking his head sadly, he says, with earnestness that far outstrips his originality, "Ah, parson, the devil never takes a vacation."

"No, indeed," the parson replies, with unexpected outburst of genuine heartiness, "he doesn't need one; he never works hard enough. If he should take my contract to drag this congregation

up-hill to heaven, instead of merely amusing himself by dancing with it on the primrose grade, he'd want a vacation every six weeks, and then he'd break down before the year was out."—*Robert J. Burdette, in Lippincott's Magazine for November.*

THE origin of the familiar Sunday-school hymn,

There is a happy land
Far, far away,

has lately been explained in the columns of the New York *Tribune*. It was composed in 1838 by Andrew Young, a man now eighty years of age, a lover both of music and of children. The tune is an old Indian air, whose melody struck Mr. Young's musical ear and haunted him until he was able to write out suitable words for an accompaniment. He sang the hymn in the presence of an intimate friend, who was a publisher, and it got into print at once, and has been translated into nineteen different languages. It is said that Thackeray once burst into tears on hearing it sung in the slums of London by a crowd of poor, ragged children sitting on the pavement. The contrast between their squalid surroundings and the ideas suggested by the words of the hymn was too much for his tender heart.—*The Congregationalist.*

JUST DO YOUR BEST.

BY JAMES WHITCOMB RILEY.

THE signs is bad when folks commence
A findin' fault with Providence,
And balkin' 'cause the earth don't shake
At ev'ry prancin' step they take.
No man is great till he can see
How less than little he would be
Ef stripped to self, and stark and bare,
He hung his sign out anywhere.

My doctern is to lay aside
Contentions, and be satisfied ;
Jest do your best, and praise er blame
That follers that counts jest the same.
I've allus noticed great success
Is mixed with troubles, more or less,
And it's the man who does the best
That gits more kicks than all the rest.

—[Selected.
—*Christian Union, N. Y.*

ZEAL in Church work cannot compensate for a personal surrender to Christ and the renewing of the Holy Spirit. And on the other hand, it may be affirmed as surely that liberal giving does not relieve one from attendance on the common means of grace and Church work. The one is fully as much out of the way as the other. What God asks of us is first ourselves and then our treasure and our talents, and the last are acceptable on account of the gift of ourselves. God cannot be satisfied with less than the consecration of ourselves and all we have and the employment of ourselves and all we have in his service. Christ willingly accepts the one talent, but he will not accept less than all of the five or ten talents with which he has endowed others. If one withholds anything at all it is an inefficient and unprofitable service that he offers. And all half service, however sincere, fails to bring the full enjoyment for which the soul pines. There are those whose zeal and liberality are most commendable, but the soul remains in unrest ; and they will never come into the perfect peace and joy of the Christian life until they give themselves wholly to the Lord.—*The Central Christian Advocate.*

LITERARY.

By a lamentable oversight the name of the author, Rev. Prof. Dr. Francis Brown, was not given under the article *Aseiology* in the November instalment of the *CONCISE DICTIONARY OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE*.

We desire to call attention to the following title, *The Lily Among Thorns: A Study of the Biblical Drama entitled The Song of Songs*. By William Elliot Griffis, D.D., pastor of the Shawmut Congregational Church, Boston, Mass., and author of "The Mikado's Empire." Boston and New York (Houghton, Mifflin & Company; the Riverside Press, Cambridge), 1890. 16mo, pp. viii., 274. We can do no more at present than notice the appearance of this volume. It is very dainty in binding, type, and shape, as befits the beautiful song of pure love which it explains. We commend Dr. Griffis' book to all students and lovers of the Word, in the full confidence that they will be instructed and edified by its contents. Of peculiar value is his defence of the Song against the slurs commonly uttered upon it. We reserve for a future number an adequate notice of the volume.

We begin our review of the magazines with *HARPER'S*. The December number is extraordinarily rich in illustrations, even for this magazine, whose usual numbers are so full of beautiful pictures. Other magazines appeal to our suffrages, but *HARPER'S* has for nine and thirty years been the favorite of the general public. Edwin A. Abbey illustrates "The Merry Wives of Windsor" in his inimitable way; Theodore Child writes appreciatively on Modern Russian Art, and the illustrations bear out his statements. There are several stories, and a novelette by Thomas Hardy, splendidly illustrated. But our attention has been particularly taken by the two articles of religious contents. The pastor of the Brick Church, New York City, Rev. Dr. Henry Van Dyke, can always be depended on to write entertainingly. His theme in this number is the "Flight into Egypt." This episode in our Lord's infancy receives appropriate treatment. Use has been made, naturally, of the apocryphal gospels, to supplement the meagre, passing notice in the canonical Matthew. He also utilizes later matter, and the whole is rendered resplendent by the illustrations. Dr. Van Dyke considers Holman Hunt's picture of the Flight into Egypt "the most important religious picture of the century." The readers are enabled to judge for themselves as to its attractiveness. The other article we mention is by Rev. H. R. Haweis, the well-known Broad Church clergyman in London, on "Oratorio and Drama." Mr. Haweis, whose name is pronounced *hoice*, by the way, is nothing if not original. He discourses on the past and future of religious music. The modern oratorio "is midway between the concert-room and the stage. It is not severely hymnal nor strictly devotional, but it abounds in meditation and praise." He looks forward to the production of a sacred music drama, the union of musical and dramatic art.

THE *CENTURY* for November, like its predecessors and rivals, is full of beautiful pictures, but the only article in its contents of special religious flavor is the first of the "Present-Day Papers," entitled "The Problems of Modern Society," written by Mr. William Chauncy Langdon. The "Present-Day Papers" are designed to discuss "certain sociological questions at present engaging attention, or of consequence to the well-being of the community." The writers who have undertaken this important service are Rev. Prof. Dr. Charles W. Shields, the author of the "Ultimate Philosophy;" Bishop Potter, of this city; Rev. Dr. Theodore T. Munger; Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D.; President Seth Low, of Columbia College; Prof. Richard T. Ely, of Johns Hopkins University, and Mr. Langdon. The last named contributes the opening paper. He pleads for a Christian sociology, one which shall study the three divine institutions—the family, the State, and the church—as divine. He states briefly the problems under each head. What he asks is that these institutions be viewed from their religious side, and rightly says that to their "interrelation the master key can be furnished only by a Christian philosophy."

THE December *CENTURY* opens with a series of unpublished letters written by the Duke of Wellington, in his very last days, to a young married lady of England. Those letters present the Iron Duke in a very attractive light—amiable and unpretending; the careful guardian of the children of his friend in their childish illnesses. Joseph Jefferson's autobiography is continued from the November number, and this month covers wide ground and goes into the most amusing details concerning "barn-storming in Mississippi," an interesting character called Pudding Stanley, Jefferson's Mexico experiences (just after the Mexican War), his reminiscences of the Wallacks, John E. Owens, Burton, etc. Mr. Charles Barnard's illustrated article on "The New Croton Aqueduct" is the first full account of that marvellous and unique engineering work. A striking feature of this paper is Mr. Barnard's exposé of the frauds in the building of the aqueduct—the empty places in the masonry being shown by means of photographs. Rev. W. E. Griffis, D.D., the well-known authority on Japan, writes of "Nature and People" in that fascinating island—more of Theodore Wores's pictures being given in this connection. The two celebrated French painters, Alfred Stevens and Gervex, give pictures of their "Paris Panorama of the Nineteenth Century," and tell how they came to construct the work, and their method of putting it on the canvas. Professor Fisher begins his striking papers in this number on "The Nature and Method of Revelation," taking up at once the subject of "Revelation and the Bible." In fiction we have Mrs. Barr's new novel, "Friend Olivia," Mr. Stockton's "The Merry Chanter," Hopkinson Smith's heroic story of "Captain Joe," founded on fact, and "The Taming of Tarlas," by a new writer. The chapters of the Lincoln Life deal with the fall of Richmond and Lincoln's visit to the abandoned capital. Mrs. Van Rensselaer gives briefly her impressions of the French Exhibition; and the editorial pages come to the defence of civil service reform.

SCRIBNER'S for December has for its first article "How the Other Half Lives, Studies among the Tenements," by Jacob A. Riis, an illustrated true story of human crime and wretchedness in New York City. Mr. Riis has had exceptional facilities and opportunities in studying life in the slums of the metropolis. The views he gives are absolutely reliable, being not fancy pictures or drawings from memory, but reproductions of instantaneous photographs made by the flash-light. They tell a very sad story of crowded dwellings, with all their inevitable accompaniments of misery and sin. Mr. Riis writes on a theme of absorbing interest, and with the authority of personal knowledge. But he has little to say about the remedial agencies. If it were not for the Christian influences brought to bear upon this mass of humanity, the state of things would be much worse. The Hon. Edward J. Phelps's article on "The Age of Words" is a timely protest against the tendency of the age to utter and print words merely to say something, anything. He shows how this really absurd phenomenon has its bad consequences; how it has vitiated literature and made the press the great scandal-monger, and so the poison is carried into all homes. One of the secret causes of the divorces and matrimonial failures is the fiction upon which the unhappy wives were brought up intellectually. The article is very vigorous. Dr. William Perry Northrup describes "The Pardon of Ste. Anne d'Auray," a unique religious festival of Brittany. On the whole, the December number strikes us as being particularly good.

LIPPINCOTT'S for December contains as its complete story—a feature this magazine now shares with the *COSMOPOLITAN*—"All He Knew," by John Habberton, which deals with the life of an ex-convict who was converted in prison. Maurice Francis Egan utters a mild protest against the "frankness"—a euphemism for indecency—of Dr. Ibsen, whose plays are being given in London. "Building Associations," by Thomas Gaffney, is the most useful article in this number. "Leon, the Siberian Exile," by Melville Phillips, is and, as are all stories of such characters.

THE *MAGAZINE OF AMERICAN HISTORY* for November has this table of contents: "Home of Charles Carroll of Carroll-

ten," by the Editor; "A Chapter from the History of Utah," by H. H. Bancroft; "Rise of a Great Masonic Library in [Cedar Rapids] Iowa," by L. J. Lauphere; "The Stone Images of San Augustin," by H. R. Lenly; "Some Beginnings of Delaware," by W. W. Taylor; "The First Iron-works in America," by N. M. Hawkes; "Relic of Braddock's Field," by Z. McDonald; "Oliver Pollock," by H. E. Hayden; "Thrilling Story of a British Surgeon's Experience in the Revolution," by A. Van Sinderen; and other minor articles and notes.

THE ATLANTIC for December is, as usual, good literature. Such articles as "Architecture in the West," by Henry Van Brunt; "Delphi: the Locality and its Legends," by William Cranston Lawton, and "Border Warfare of the Revolution," by John Fiske, would, in the illustrated magazines, have elaborate and costly pictures. But in THE ATLANTIC there are no pictures, and they are not missed, the letter-press is so good.

THE COSMOPOLITAN for December contains a lively article of interest to those who study foreign missions, "The Capital of the Dragon's Empire" (Peking), by Frank G. Carpenter. The illustrations are particularly good; that of the temple of Heaven will be looked at with the interest which attaches to past things; for the temple was destroyed by fire September 28th. Mr. Carpenter says that in Peking all religions are represented: there is a Mohammedan mosque, a great temple filled with Lamas from Tibet, and the chapels of the Christian missionaries, and the great observatory founded by the Jesuits. Mr. Edward Everett Hale, in the department "Social Problems," writes appositely on the influence of Christmas, or, rather, of the birth of Christ, upon the race. We all lead different lives, and have a quite different outlook on social problems. We are inspired by the example of Christ, and counting God on our side, we labor hopefully for the benefit of others. Mr. Hale informs us that a W. C. T. U. has been opened in Tokio! Japan is being rapidly civilized! He proposes to some philanthropist to erect residential flats for ladies similar to those in London, and mentions several remedial institutions, and the establishment of the Order of the Royal Law, a new species of the genus Wadsworth.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD for November is at hand. Great improvement is noticeable in this Review from its initial number. It now presents a most valuable record, month by month, of the doings of the missionary host. We have only congratulations upon the success of the editors. The November number has in its table of contents the following: "The American Missionary in the Orient," by the author of the striking article "Islam and Christian Missions" in the August number; "The Great Crisis in Japan," by Rev. Dr. F. F. Ellinwood, one of the secretaries of the Foreign Board of the Presbyterian Church; "The Historic Churches of the East," by Prof. George H. Schodde, Ph.D.; "The Student Missionary Uprising," by John R. Mott; "A Christian College at San Paulo, Brazil," by Rev. Dr. G. W. Chamberlain. Rev. Charles C. Starbuck furnishes a translation of an article on the Continental Missionary Conference at Bremen, and also his usual condensed translations from foreign missionary journals, which constitutes so valuable a feature of this Review. Besides the articles named, the number contains the usual seven departments, made up from different sources—"General Missionary Intelligence," "Missionary Correspondence from all Parts of the World-field;" "International Department," conducted by Rev. Dr. G. T. Gracey; "The Monthly Concert of Missions," by Rev. Dr. A. T. Pierson; "Editorial Notes on Current Topics;" "Organized Missionary Work and Statistics," and, finally, "Progress of Missions—Monthly Bulletin."

The following religious works are announced as about to appear in England:

MESSRS. GEORGE BELL & SONS.

The Works of Flavius Josephus, Whiston's translation, revised by the Rev. A. R. Shilleto, with topographical and geographical notes by Sir C. W. Wilson, 5 vols.

Life and Epistles of St. Paul, new edition, by the late Mr. Lewin.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

The Rest of the Words of Baruch, a Christian Apocalypse of the year 136 A.D., the text revised with an introduction by J. Rendel Harris, M.A., formerly Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, and now Professor of Biblical Languages in Haverford College, Pennsylvania, royal 8vo.

The Gospel History of Our Lord Jesus Christ in the Language of the Revised Version, arranged in a connected narrative, especially for the use of teachers and preachers, by Rev. C. James, M.A., Rector of Wortham, Suffolk, and late Fellow of Kings College.

CLARENDON PRESS.

SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST, second series:—

Vedic Hymns, translated by F. Max Müller, Part I., Vol. 32.

Nārada, and some minor law books, translated by Julius Jolly, Vol. 33.

The Vedānta-Sūtras, with Sankara's Commentary, translated by G. Thibaut, Vol. 34.

Milinda Pañha, translated by T. W. Rhys Davids, Vol. 35.

The Nāsaka, translated by E. W. West, Vol. 37.

MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK.

"Beyond the Stars," or Heaven, its Inhabitants, Occupations, and Life, by Thomas Hamilton, D.D., President of Queen's College, Belfast; a new and cheaper edition, revised throughout.

The Way, the Nature and Means of Revelation, by John Weir, M.A., Dean of the Department of Fine Arts, Yale University.

The second issue of the "Foreign Theological Library" for this year will comprise:—

Professor C. E. Luthardt's "History of Christian Ethics," translated by Rev. Wm. Hastie, B.D.

Professor C. von Orelli's "The Prophecies of Jeremiah," translated by Rev. Professor J. S. Banks.

MESSRS. HODDER & STOUGHTON.

Imago Christi, the example of Jesus Christ, by the Rev. James Stalker, M.A., author of "The Life of Jesus Christ," "The Life of St. Paul," etc., crown 8vo, cloth.

The Christian Ministry, its origin, constitution, nature, and work, the Donellan lectures for 1888, together with notes and appendices, by the Very Rev. William Lefroy, D.D., Dean of Norwich, 1 vol., 8vo.

The Philanthropy of God, by the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, M.A., author of "Social Christianity," crown 8vo, cloth.

Studies on the Epistles, by the Rev. Professor F. Godet, D.D., translated by Mrs. Annie Harwood Holmden, crown 8vo, cloth.

The Second Part of John G. Paton, an autobiography, edited by his brother, the Rev. James Paton, B.A., Vol. II., crown 8vo, cloth.

Charles Stanford, D.D., Memories and Letters, edited by his Wife, with etched portrait by Manesse, crown 8vo, cloth.

Ireland and the Anglo-Norman Church, a History of Ireland and Irish Christianity from the Anglo-Norman Conquest to the Dawn of the Reformation, by the Rev. G. T. Stokes, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin, and author of "Ireland and the Celtic Church," etc., crown 8vo, cloth.

The Revelation of John, an exposition, by P. W. Grant, author of "The Bible Record of Creation True for Every Age," crown 8vo, cloth.

CONCISE DICTIONARY
OF
RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EDITED BY

REV. SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, M.A.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

REV. TALBOT WILSON CHAMBERS, D.D., LL.D.,

Of the Collegiate Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, New York City,

AND

REV. FRANK HUGH FOSTER, PH.D.,

Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary, Oberlin, Ohio.

[THIS DICTIONARY WAS BEGUN IN THE OCTOBER NUMBER AND WILL BE
CONTINUED IN THE SUCCESSIVE NUMBERS, FIVE HUNDRED PAGES APPEARING
WITHIN THE YEAR.]

NEW YORK:
THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE COMPANY.
1889.